

a prohibition of gambling and the opium trade—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. SPALDING: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and 43 citizens of Engleville, N. Dak., in favor of the anti-canteen bill—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, resolutions adopted at a conference of the governors of arid-land States, held in Salt Lake City, Utah, in relation to the public arid lands of the United States—to the Committee Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, petition of F. W. Burrows, S. A. Klov, and other retail druggists, Cooperstown and Bathgate, N. Dak., for the repeal of the stamp tax on proprietary medicines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of the Holland Dames of the New Netherlands, New York, urging the selection of a national hymn, to be used and known as such, and suggesting the "Star Spangled Banner"—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WACHTER: Petition of Louis Schulze and 108 wholesale and retail druggists of Baltimore, Md., in favor of the pure food and drug bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to John D. C. Adams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill granting a pension to Myers Uhlfelder, private, Fourth Regiment Maryland Volunteers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Mrs. Mary Shannon, administratrix of the estate of Joseph R. Shannon, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS: Petition of J. A. Kinnaman and other soldiers in the late civil war, residing in Flora, Ill., for the passage of a civil-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill for the relief of Jennie Langtree—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. YOUNG: Petition of the A. Colburn Company, Philadelphia, asking for the defeat of Senate bill No. 4047, as affecting the manufacture of baking powder—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Philadelphia Engineering Works, Limited, relating to Senate bill No. 4300, and the organization of officers in the Ordnance Department—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of George W. Atherton, of the Pennsylvania State College, asking for the passage of Senate bill No. 3982, for the establishment of department of mines in connection with land-grant colleges—to the Committee on Education.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, May 23, 1900.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the Journal may be dispensed with.

Mr. KEAN. I think the Journal had better be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PLATT of Connecticut). Objection is made. The reading of the Journal will be continued.

The Secretary resumed and concluded the reading of the Journal, and it was approved.

COLLECTION OF CUSTOMS REVENUE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, recommending that the further sum of \$100,000 be appropriated for the expenses of collecting the revenue from customs of accounts to be presented after the close of the fiscal year, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

BUREAU OF STATISTICS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, recommending that an appropriation of \$540 be made for the rental of an additional room in the Adams Building for the accommodation of the Bureau of Statistics, Treasury Department; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

COLUMBIA RIVER IMPROVEMENT.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a dispatch sent by the Portland (Oreg.) Chamber of Commerce to the President of the Senate, and will ask that it be read, if there be no objection. The Chair thinks that the practice of reading telegrams in the nature of petitions is hardly within the rule, but it has been customary.

The telegram was read and referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

[Telegram.]

PORTLAND, OREG., May 22, 1900.

The President of the United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The people of Oregon earnestly request emergency appropriation of

\$250,000 for repairing the present jetty and putting plant in order for improvement mouth of Columbia River, of which Oregon delegation and chief engineers fully informed these repairs absolutely necessary for holding channel from further shoaling as far as can be done until appropriations allowed for extending the jetty.

PORTLAND CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution of the Senate requesting the President to return to the Senate the bill (S. 3215) granting an increase of pension to Andrew F. Dinsmore.

The message also announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. R. 76) withdrawing certain lands on the island of Oahu, Hawaii, from the public domain.

The message further announced that the House had passed with amendments the bill (S. 3490) in relation to admissions to and dismissions from the Reform School of the District of Columbia; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the second report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8582) making appropriation for the support of the Regular and Volunteer Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 5450) to limit the effect of the regulation of interstate commerce between the several States in goods, wares, and merchandise wholly or in part manufactured by convict labor or in any prison or reformatory;

A bill (H. R. 6882) limiting the hours of daily services of laborers and mechanics employed upon work done for the United States, or any Territory, or the District of Columbia, thereby securing better products, and for other purposes;

A bill (H. R. 9827) to close all alleys in block 3 of the Walbridge subdivision of Ingleside, in the county of Washington; and

A bill (H. R. 10380) to extend to certain publications the privileges of second-class mail matter as to admission to the mails.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills:

A bill (H. R. 2156) for the relief of Oliver M. Blair, administrator of Thomas P. Blair, deceased;

A bill (H. R. 6634) to enlarge the powers of the Department of Agriculture prohibiting the transportation by interstate commerce of game killed in violation of local laws, and for other purposes;

A bill (H. R. 8369) to detach the county of Concho from the western judicial district of Texas and attach the same to the northern judicial district of Texas, and for other purposes;

A bill (H. R. 9711) making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, and for other purposes; and

A bill (H. R. 9879) to detach certain counties from the United States judicial district of northern California and to annex such counties to the United States judicial district of southern California; to divide said southern district of California into two divisions, and to provide for the holding of terms of court at the city of Fresno and city of Los Angeles.

PETITION.

Mr. DAVIS presented a petition of the State Homeopathic Institute of Minnesota, praying for the enactment of legislation providing arsenization prophylaxis of Asiatic cholera and yellow fever; which was referred to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

BIG TREES OF CALIFORNIA.

Mr. PERKINS. I present a report, with accompanying illustrations, on the big trees of California, which has been prepared by the Division of Forestry, Department of Agriculture. I move that the report be printed as a document, in accordance with the recommendation of the Secretary of Agriculture.

The motion was agreed to.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER IMPROVEMENT.

Mr. COCKRELL. I present a copy of the opinion of the Attorney-General relative to the contract entered into by the United States with James B. Eads for the improvement of the South Pass of the Mississippi River. I move that the opinion be printed as a document.

The motion was agreed to.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. KENNEY, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4073) granting an increase of pension to Robert A. Edwards, jr., reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4556) granting an increase of pension to William Fox, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. DAVIS, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an amendment proposing to appropriate \$500 to pay Hawkins Taylor, assistant clerk to the Committee on Foreign Relations, for extra services, etc., intended to be proposed to the general deficiency appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by himself on the 18th instant proposing to appropriate \$2,288.03 to enable the Secretary of State to carry into effect the act for the disposal of the accretions of the *Virginus* indemnity fund, intended to be proposed to the general deficiency appropriation bill, reported favorably thereon, and moved that it be printed and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations; which was agreed to.

Mr. WETMORE, from the Committee on the Library, reported an amendment proposing to appropriate \$10,000 for the purchase of the bronze statue of Rochambeau and pedestal for the same and its erection on a site belonging to the Government in the city of Washington, intended to be proposed to the sundry civil appropriation bill, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed; which was agreed to.

Mr. PRITCHARD, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4022) granting a pension to William B. Caldwell, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PRITCHARD. I am directed by the Committee on Patents, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 149) referring to the Court of Claims the claim of William E. Woodbridge for compensation for the use by the United States of his invention relating to projectiles, for which letters patent were ordered to issue to him March 25, 1852, to report it with an amendment, and to submit a report thereon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. PRITCHARD. I move that the bill (S. 794) referring to the Court of Claims the claim of William E. Woodbridge for compensation for the use by the United States of his invention relating to projectiles, for which letters patent were ordered to issue to him March 25, 1852, being Order of Business No. 631 on the Calendar, be postponed indefinitely, and that the House bill just reported by me be given the place of the Senate bill on the Calendar.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. I am directed by the Committee on Appropriations, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 11212) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes, to report it with sundry amendments, and I also submit a brief printed report explanatory of the amendments. I shall call up the bill at the earliest practical moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GALLINGER in the chair). The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. VEST, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4817) to authorize the construction of a railroad bridge across the Mississippi River at St. Paul, Minn., reported it without amendment.

BILLS INDEFINITELY POSTPONED.

Mr. McMILLAN. I move that the bill (S. 2638) authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to enter into a contract for the collection and disposal of garbage and dead animals in said District, now on the Calendar, be indefinitely postponed, the subject-matter having been covered by legislation in the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McMILLAN. I move that the same action be taken on the bill (S. 1873) to provide for the purchase of certain property for school purposes, the legislation having been embodied in the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

NANCY E. NEELY.

Mr. BAKER submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 517) granting a pension to Nancy E. Neely, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House, and agree to the same.

LUCIEN BAKER.
GEORGE TURNER.

Managers on the part of the Senate.

H. C. LOUDENSLAGER,

J. H. BROMWELL,

S. W. DAVENPORT.

Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. BAKER introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 4818) granting an increase of pension to John D. C. Herriman;

A bill (S. 4819) granting a pension to Ann Wilburn (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 4820) granting an increase of pension to Catharine Robinson (with accompanying papers).

Mr. BATE introduced a bill (S. 4821) to provide for trial and punishment in cases of contempt of court; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. BATE. I move that the bill lie on the table and be printed.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. KENNEY introduced a bill (S. 4822) to reimburse the State of Delaware for moneys due said State on account of the war of 1812; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. HARRIS introduced a bill (S. 4823) granting a pension to Cassie Orme; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. McCOMAS introduced a bill (S. 4824) for the relief of James Legg; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4825) for the relief of Anna M. Anderson and Charles L. G. Anderson, executors of George W. Anderson, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PENROSE introduced a bill (S. 4826) for the relief of Col. Charles B. Dougherty and other members of the Ninth Regiment of Pennsylvania Infantry; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 4827) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to set aside certain described lands in San Juan County, Colo., as a legal subdivision or lot, and authorizing the mayor of Silverton to enter said lands for cemetery purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. TILLMAN submitted an amendment relative to the use of the dredge or dredges employed in connection with the work of improvement at the entrance to Winyale Bay, and other dredges used on Winyale Bay River system and canals, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. TURLEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 11646) making provision for emergencies in river and harbor works, for certain surveys, and for the diversion of certain appropriations or modification of provisions heretofore made; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. QUARLES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 11646) making provision for emergencies in river and harbor works, for certain surveys, and for the diversion of certain appropriations or modification of provisions heretofore made; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. ROSS submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for the limit of the cost of the public building at Newport, Vt., from \$50,000 to \$125,000, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor:

A bill (H. R. 5450) to limit the effect of the regulation of interstate commerce between the several States in goods, wares, and merchandise wholly or in part manufactured by convict labor or in any prison reformatory; and

A bill (H. R. 6882) limiting the hours of daily services of laborers and mechanics employed upon work done for the United States, or any Territory, or the District of Columbia, thereby securing better products, and for other purposes.

The bill (H. R. 9827) to close all alleys in block 3 of the Walbridge subdivision of Ingleside, in the county of Washington, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The bill (H. R. 10380) to extend to certain publications the privileges of second-class mail matter as to admission to the mails was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. O. L. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had on the 22d instant approved and signed the following acts:

An act (S. 139) granting a pension to Adelaide Sessions;

An act (S. 289) granting a pension to John B. Turchin;

An act (S. 477) granting a pension to Levi C. Faight;

An act (S. 657) granting a pension to Matthew Redmond;

An act (S. 1030) granting a pension to Catharine Harris;

An act (S. 1266) granting a pension to Jacob Saladin;

An act (S. 1833) granting a pension to Mary B. Christopher;
 An act (S. 1954) granting a pension to Edward L. Ruby;
 An act (S. 2441) granting a pension to Felix G. Sittin;
 An act (S. 2881) granting a pension to Mary A. Parker;
 An act (S. 3200) granting a pension to John P. Hinsley;
 An act (S. 3352) granting a pension to Sarah Kersey;
 An act (S. 3480) granting a pension to John Holland;
 An act (S. 3502) granting a pension to Elizabeth Whisler;
 An act (S. 4030) granting a pension to Helen M. Glenney;
 An act (S. 36) granting an increase of pension to Emma G. Sar-
 gent;
 An act (S. 135) granting an increase of pension to Frances C.
 De Russey;
 An act (S. 316) granting an increase of pension to Louann A.
 Perry;
 An act (S. 480) granting an increase of pension to Juliet Gregory;
 An act (S. 649) granting an increase of pension to Martha Mad-
 docks;
 An act (S. 682) granting an increase of pension to Wilhelmina
 Hippler;
 An act (S. 757) granting an increase of pension to William C.
 Stockton;
 An act (S. 817) granting an increase of pension to Julia A.
 Taylor;
 An act (S. 1031) granting an increase of pension to Thomas H.
 Kearney;
 An act (S. 1191) granting an increase of pension to Orpha W.
 Reynolds;
 An act (S. 1319) granting an increase of pension to Annie E.
 Joseph;
 An act (S. 1578) granting an increase of pension to George W.
 Campbell, alias George W. Smith;
 An act (S. 1601) granting an increase of pension to John
 Thornton;
 An act (S. 1603) granting an increase of pension to John W.
 Kaump;
 An act (S. 1803) granting an increase of pension to Richard L.
 Titsworth;
 An act (S. 1909) granting an increase of pension to Cecelia A.
 Price;
 An act (S. 1918) granting an increase of pension to John E. Hig-
 gins;
 An act (S. 2154) granting an increase of pension to William A.
 Owens;
 An act (S. 2335) granting an increase of pension to John W.
 Blake;
 An act (S. 2463) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Leddy;
 An act (S. 2510) granting an increase of pension to Caroline C.
 Townsend;
 An act (S. 2570) granting an increase of pension to John M.
 Swift;
 An act (S. 2650) granting an increase of pension to Katharine
 Taylor Dodge;
 An act (S. 2652) granting an increase of pension to Louisa E.
 Baylor;
 An act (S. 2764) granting an increase of pension to William
 Murphy;
 An act (S. 2983) granting an increase of pension to Isaac H.
 Lynn;
 An act (S. 2994) granting an increase of pension to Fanny F.
 Robertson;
 An act (S. 3033) granting an increase of pension to William J.
 Wallace;
 An act (S. 3206) granting an increase of pension to Moses
 King, jr.;
 An act (S. 3380) granting an increase of pension to Hamilton K.
 Williams;
 An act (S. 3508) granting an increase of pension to Edward F.
 Phelps;
 An act (S. 3630) granting an increase of pension to Jacob N.
 Smith;
 An act (S. 3748) granting an increase of pension to Washington
 Baker;
 An act (S. 3790) granting an increase of pension to Anna M.
 Collier;
 An act (S. 3797) granting an increase of pension to John H.
 Streeter;
 An act (S. 3879) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Gause;
 and
 An act (S. 4291) to constitute Durham, N. C., a port of delivery
 in the customs collection district of Pamlico, and to extend the
 privileges of the seventh section of the act of Congress approved
 June 10, 1880, to said port.
 The message also announced that the President of the United
 States had on this day approved and signed the following acts:
 An act (S. 299) granting a pension to Susanna Marion;
 An act (S. 1029) granting a pension to Henry B. Lambe; and
 An act (S. 2290) granting a pension to James Richardson.

CUBAN INVESTIGATION.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. If there are no Senate resolutions, I ask that the resolution which has come over from a former day and is subject to call may be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GALLINGER in the chair). The Chair lays the resolution before the Senate.

Mr. MORGAN. I hope the Senator will allow me to call up the resolution which I offered yesterday.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I think this resolution takes precedence of resolutions which were offered yesterday. It has been lying on the table subject to call for some time. I gave notice yesterday that I would call it up to-day.

Mr. MORGAN. The resolutions I offered yesterday are merely pro forma, to get information from two different Departments, the War and the Navy.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Let this resolution come up, and then I will yield to the Senator.

Mr. MORGAN. Those resolutions will lead to no debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution called up by the Senator from Connecticut will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A resolution, by Mr. BACON, directing the Committee on Relations with Cuba to investigate and report to the Senate regarding the moneys received and expended in the island of Cuba by, through, and under officials and representatives of the United States.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President—

Mr. MORGAN. Now the Senator from Connecticut yields to me to call up a resolution.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I will yield to the Senator from Alabama and afterwards to the Senator from Nebraska.

COST OF NAVAL TRANSPORTATION, ETC.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution submitted yesterday by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN], which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy is directed to furnish to the Senate, as fully and accurately as is practicable at this time, answers to the following inquiries:

SECTION 1. Since May 1, 1898, what armed vessels, tenders, and war ships have been sent to the Philippine Islands by order of the Secretary of the Navy, or from said islands to other ports or places, giving the name, tonnage, and the time and place of departure and arrival, and the distance of sea travel of each voyage?

What is the cost of fuel consumed on each of said voyages, and the cost per ton of such fuel at the port of Manila, for each month during the period since said May 1, 1898?

SEC. 2. What tolls have been paid to the Suez Canal Company on each vessel sent through said canal by order of the Secretary of the Navy, and the price per ton paid for each vessel since May 1, 1898?

SEC. 3. What distance was covered, and in what time, by the battle ship *Oregon* in her voyage from the Pacific coast to Key West; and in her voyage, subsequently, from the Atlantic coast of the United States to Manila; and whether said voyages, respectively, were made within a reasonable time? What was the cost of the coal consumed on each voyage by the *Oregon*?

What was the cost of coal consumed on each ship under the command of Admiral Dewey on his return from Manila to the United States, and what distance was covered in that voyage?

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I have examined this resolution since yesterday. I find no assertion of fact in the resolution. It is, although somewhat long, only a resolution of inquiry, and I see no objection to its passage.

The resolution was agreed to.

COST OF ARMY TRANSPORTATION, ETC.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following resolution submitted yesterday by Mr. MORGAN:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War is directed to furnish to the Senate, as fully and accurately as is practicable at this time, answers to the following inquiries:

SECTION 1. What has been the cost to the United States since May 1, 1898, of the transportation paid to or due to railroad companies for the transportation of officers and men in service with the Army of the United States, and of animals, property, munitions, equipment, arms and supplies of every kind belonging to the Quartermaster, Commissary, and Ordnance Departments of the Army, sent to the Philippine Islands from the Pacific coast or brought from any of said islands to the Pacific coast of the United States and sent to their destination from that coast to any part of the United States?

SEC. 2. What has been the cost of transportation, by sea, of the officers, men, animals, and other belongings of the Army mentioned in section 1 of these resolutions, since May 1, 1898, to Manila or other ports in the Philippine Islands, or from such ports to the ports of the United States on the Pacific and Atlantic oceans?

SEC. 3. What tolls, and at what price per ton, and what fares or charges, for passengers, have been paid by the United States since May 1, 1898, to the Suez Canal Company for transports or troop ships and for troops passing through said canal, and the tonnage of each ship and its draft?

SEC. 4. What sum has been paid to each railroad company, or each line or system of railroads, naming the same, that terminates on or near the Pacific coast, for the transportation that is mentioned or referred to in section 1 of this resolution, so as to designate the system of railroads, known as the transcontinental railroad lines, on which such transportation was furnished?

Mr. LODGE. I do not think there is any objection to the resolution. I think it is exactly the same as the preceding.

The resolution was agreed to.

ROBERT MORAN.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I yield now to the Senator from Nebraska, unless the bill which he wishes to have passed should be debated.

Mr. ALLEN. By the courtesy of the Senator from Connecticut, I ask unanimous consent to call up the bill (S. 3115) granting an increase of pension to Robert Moran. It is rather urgent that it should be taken up at this time.

The Secretary read the bill; and by unanimous consent the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. It proposes to place on the pension roll the name of Robert Moran, late lieutenant-colonel Second Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and to pay him a pension at the rate of \$72 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CUBAN INVESTIGATION.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the following resolution, submitted by Mr. BACON on the 11th instant:

Resolved, That the Committee on Relations with Cuba is hereby directed to investigate and report to the Senate as early as practicable regarding the moneys received and expended in the island of Cuba by, through, and under the officials and representatives of the United States, both civil and military, from the date of the occupation of Cuba by the military forces of the United States until and including the 30th day of April, 1900.

Said committee shall investigate and report as to receipts as follows: From customs; from postal service; from internal revenue; from all other sources, specifying the details as far as practicable, and particularly the places where and dates within which said amounts were collected or received, and the officer or officers collecting and receiving the same, as well as the law or authority under which said amounts were in each instance so collected or received.

Said committee shall investigate and report as to the expenditures of the said amounts so received, the necessity and propriety thereof, specifying in classes and in detail, so far as practicable, said expenditures, and particularly the work, services, or property for which said expenditures were made and the value thereof, also the law or authority under which each of said expenditures was made, the officer, civil or military, by whom said expenditure was authorized, and the officer, civil or military, by whom said expenditure was made, and the particular fund from which the money was taken for said expenditure.

Said committee shall also report a statement of all public works of every kind, including buildings, wharves, railroads, and all other structures built or constructed, improved, repaired, or decorated by or under the authority of any such officer, civil or military, and in each instance the cost, value, necessity, and propriety of the same, and the uses to which said buildings or structures have been put. Where said buildings and works were constructed or improvements were made by contract, or where the material used in the same was furnished by contract, the committee shall report copies of each of said contracts and the names of all parties interested in each of the same.

Said committee shall also report a statement of the personal property which was purchased or procured and intrusted to any officer, civil or military, in Cuba within said time, the cost and value of the same, and the uses to which said property has been put and the disposition which has been made thereof.

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. BACON to the resolution (S. Res. No. 327) directing the Committee on Relations with Cuba to investigate and report relative to receipts and expenditures in Cuba, viz: Insert the following:

That said committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall have the power to send for persons and papers, to administer oaths, and to examine witnesses under oath touching the matters which they are hereby empowered to investigate, and may, either by full committee or subcommittee, hold their sessions during the sessions of the Senate or during the recess of Congress at such place or places as they may determine to be necessary or important for the efficient and proper execution of this order either in the United States or in Cuba, to employ stenographers and such clerical assistance as may be deemed advisable; and the necessary and proper expense incurred in the execution of this order shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, upon vouchers approved by the chairman of said committee.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Mr. President, when this resolution was presented by the Senator from Georgia I asked that it might go over, not that I intended to oppose the passage of the resolution, but I thought that some remarks made by the Senator from Georgia in advocating its passage called for examination.

About a month ago Major-General Wood, military governor in the island of Cuba, was led to suppose or to fear that there had been irregularities, possibly peculations and embezzlements, in that portion of the government which was under the immediate control of the director-general of posts. He at once organized an inspection of the accounts of Mr. Rathbone, who was in charge of that branch of the service, which has been unsparingly pursued from that time to the present.

The Senator from Georgia, I think, or certainly the newspapers to which he gives credence, seem to think that all the official malfeasance and wrongdoing which have been discovered have been brought to light by others than those connected with the administration of affairs in the island of Cuba. It is to General Wood that the credit of discovering these official wrongs and criminalities belongs. It is to the Administration that belongs the credit of investigating and probing the matter to the bottom and using every possible effort to bring those who have been guilty of wrongdoing to trial and to punishment.

The Senator from Georgia has no monopoly of the sense of humiliation, indignation, and shame which should be and are felt by every honest and patriotic man in the United States. The disclosures in Cuba with reference to the postal affairs of that island are shocking. They strike a blow, and a direct blow, at every citizen of the United States. If the defalcation of Mr. Neely had occurred in Boston, or New York, or Washington, it would have been a sad and shameful affair, but it would not have been so sad and so shameful as when it occurs in a country which

may be said to be at present under our guardianship, for the administration of whose affairs with honesty and economy we are responsible not only to the people of Cuba but to ourselves and to the world as well.

Nothing that has occurred in the history of defalcations has made such an impression upon the public mind as this, and justly so; and more than in any other case is it incumbent upon the Government to probe this to the very bottom, unsparingly, unceasingly, without hesitation, without reference to who may be complicated or concerned.

Mr. President, I wish to remark right here that the Republican party never tolerates fraud or peculation or embezzlement. Neither the Republican Administration nor the members of the Committee on Relations with Cuba need any prodding from the party in opposition to induce them to make a most searching investigation and to use every possible effort to punish summarily and severely any persons who may have been guilty of wrongdoing or of criminality or irregularity in reference to the affairs of the government of Cuba.

But, Mr. President, there are some things that ought to be remembered in connection with this, that ought to be remembered by those patriots who, with a Presidential election approaching, hold up their hands in holy horror and seize upon what has been disclosed to endeavor to cast discredit not only upon the Administration, but upon their country as well. It ought to be remembered that in three years and three months of the present Administration this is the first occasion when they have had an opportunity to criticize in this respect. It ought to be remembered that whenever in years past there has been disclosed any instance of wrongdoing on the part of officials during a Republican Administration, that wrongdoing has been most mercilessly and thoroughly exposed and punished.

Rarely, Mr. President, during Republican Administrations have there been defalcations and frauds. There were during the Administration of General Grant what were known as the star-route frauds, and when that distinguished general and equally distinguished President uttered the words "Let no guilty man escape," he struck the keynote of confidence throughout the United States. And when, as I shall show before I get through, President McKinley has, in words almost equally concise and pertinent, directed that this scandal shall be probed to the bottom and that every guilty person shall be punished, he will be accorded a verdict of confidence from the people of the United States.

As I said, General Wood's suspicion was directed to the fact that there were irregularities in the postal accounts of Cuba. The management of the post-office affairs in Cuba was not directly under his control. Nominally it was, for he was the military governor of Cuba. Hearing or suspecting that there might be frauds or irregularities, he detailed an inspector, a military officer, as I understand—at any rate, an inspector under his own immediate command—to investigate the postal affairs. The result was, so far as disclosed, that the inspector found that a clerk by the name of Neely had been appropriating funds belonging to the Cuban postal revenues. That clerk left for the United States as soon as the investigation was commenced. He was followed by Inspector Burton to the United States, was arrested, has been held for trial, and at the suggestion of that inspector a suit for the recovery of the money has been instituted against him upon which he is required to give \$50,000 bail, as he was required to give \$20,000 bail under the original criminal charge.

I think perhaps that is all that need be said respecting the extent of the frauds which have been discovered. The defalcation amounts, as we are informed, for the months of this year, January, February, March, and April, to about \$45,000. It is suspected that the wrongdoing, the embezzlement, commenced earlier. It is not believed that there will be any eventual loss to the Cuban revenues or to the Government of the United States.

So much we know; but this has been seized upon to charge by innuendo, by rumor, by every means in which suspicion can be aroused, that the whole administration of affairs in Cuba is honeycombed with fraud, to use the language, I think, of the Senator from Georgia; that millions upon millions have been misappropriated, and that the people of Cuba have been plundered wholesale by the officers of the Government who are there in administration. I take this language of the Senator to be a direct charge:

Only through the searching examination of witnesses and the personal examination of the locality and of the public works which have been constructed can there be detected the plunder of millions of dollars through jobs given to favorites and through dishonest contracts and dishonest work under contracts.

Who knows that, Mr. President? Aside from the partisan newspapers, which seem to roll every suspicion as a sweet morsel under their tongues, who knows that there has been a dishonest contract there?

I agree, Mr. President, that when these charges have been made, when rumor and suspicion and scandal mongering fill the air, an investigation by a Congressional or Senatorial committee becomes necessary. I have seen nothing of fact which I think renders a Congressional investigation necessary; nothing of admitted fact,

nothing of proven fact, which requires any investigation, unless it be the defalcation to which I have already alluded.

The Senator from Georgia makes the most astonishing proposition with reference to that that I have ever heard. If I understand him, he thinks that the postal defalcation of Mr. Neely and the accounts of the director of posts should be examined by a Congressional committee and not by a committee under the executive branch of the Government. I wonder what he would have said, I wonder what the newspapers, who are so anxious to find something to cast discredit upon the Administration—never thinking, apparently, that to discredit the Administration in this matter is to discredit their own country—I wonder what they would say if there had not been the swiftest investigation on the part of the Executive, particularly on the part of the Post-Office Department?

Mr. BACON. I beg the Senator's pardon. I did not hear him distinctly, and I will be obliged to him if he will repeat his statement about discrediting the Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Certainly.

Mr. BACON. I did not hear the Senator's statement, and that is the reason I ask him to repeat it.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I said I understood the Senator from Georgia to say that the investigation of the postal frauds and embezzlement in Cuba ought to be undertaken by a Congressional or Senatorial committee, and not by the Department within which they occurred. This is what the Senator said:

Now, Mr. President, to return from the diversion, it is going to be contended here, I imagine from certain intimations I have had from Senators of the dominant party, that this investigation ought not to be undertaken by Congress, but that it ought to be left to the Executive Departments. I shall have something more to say about that subject; but I wish to say in passing here that with the statement just made, which I have no doubt is true, as to the large number of men charged with the duty of investigating in Cuba and seeing that the postal department was properly managed there, and with their utter failure to comply with their duty, in the presence of this immense embezzlement of funds, the proper authority to investigate is not the same body of men among whom these frauds have been committed, and among others of them who, while themselves innocent, and who, while they have no connection with the frauds, will, by reason of their most unfortunate association officially with those who are guilty, have of necessity to be included in the scope of the investigation.

Mr. BACON. Now, will the Senator please read in connection with that, on page 6160, in the right-hand column, beginning about the middle of my remarks on that occasion? The sentence begins, "Mr. President, if it were only the Post-Office Department," etc.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I will read what is before that.

Mr. BACON. Very well.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. The Senator said:

But the question is whether the Congress of the United States should sit still and do nothing, or whether, in the face of this gross violation of duty, these villainous thefts of Cuban funds by the officers of one of the Departments of the Government, we shall say that we will go to the bottom of it, or whether we shall leave it for others to attempt to do so.

Mr. President, if it were only the Post-Office Department which was involved, there might be a strong argument presented as to why this investigation should be left to the Post-Office officials, because they are a trained body of men familiar with those matters, and perhaps better capacitated than any others for a proper investigation of the facts, and if an investigation shall be entered upon by the Senate those officers must be largely used in the prosecution of the investigation. But it is not a proper thing in my opinion, in any instance where there has been a widespread conspiracy by which there have been embezzlements of the funds of one Department, to leave the investigation altogether to that Department.

Mr. BACON. The Senator will notice the word "altogether."

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I can place no other meaning upon all the clauses that I have read than that the Senator from Georgia felt that the investigation of this matter could not be safely left to the executive department and to the Post-Office Department—that they would not thoroughly investigate and probe this matter to the bottom. If that is not the exact language which the Senator used, it is certainly the inference to be drawn from it. It is but another way in which it is sought to cast suspicion and discredit upon the Administration.

Mr. BACON. Will the Senator, in that connection, kindly read the next paragraph, as he read the one preceding?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I think I have read all that is necessary to read. If the Senator desires to read all of his speech again, or any portion of it, I shall be very glad to have him do so.

I think, Mr. President, that we can not well interfere with the investigation which is being made by the executive department and by the Postmaster-General. To interfere with it while it is going on would defeat very likely the ends of justice.

I recur to my question. What would be said by the Senator, what would be said by the newspapers, by the partisan press, if there had been no effort made on the part of the Post-Office Department to investigate, or on the part of General Wood to investigate this matter, and punish those who have been engaged in it? It is a duty which is placed upon the Post-Office Department, and it is a duty which is willingly performed by that Department.

I wish right in this connection, Mr. President, to read the instruction which has been given to Fourth Assistant Postmaster-

General Bristow when he was directed to go to Cuba to probe this matter to the bottom. I have here the letter of the Postmaster-General of May 12, and, as it is short, I will read that first:

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL,
Washington, May 12, 1900.

SIR: You are directed to proceed to Habana, Cuba, at once. As you are aware, a force of inspectors has been detailed to make a thorough investigation into the administration of the postal service of the island. Besides giving the inspectors the benefit of your counsel, it will be your special duty to examine and report upon the organization of the department of posts. You will confer freely with the Governor-General, and will hold yourself in readiness for any service that may be indicated by later instructions.

Very respectfully,

CH. EMORY SMITH, Postmaster-General.

HON. JOSEPH L. BRISTOW,
Fourth Assistant Postmaster-General.

On the 16th this supplementary letter was written:

MAY 16, 1900.

SIR: Supplementing my letter of May 12, directing you to proceed at once to Cuba, the following further instructions are given for your guidance:

You will immediately on your arrival at Habana confer freely and fully with General Wood, military governor, and will keep in constant communication with him in the work on which you enter. You will cooperate with the military governor both in the investigation of all irregularities in the postal service of Cuba and in any measures for the reorganization of the system that may be undertaken.

The examination by the inspectors, already provided for, will have begun before your arrival. You will assume general supervision of this examination, and will enforce the instruction heretofore given that it shall be of the most searching and thorough character. If you find that you need a still larger force for the prompt and complete performance of this duty, you will call for it. The investigation must be comprehensive and minute, covering every branch of the service and all classes of officials. Its prosecution must be governed solely by the purpose of ascertaining the truth and the whole truth, and it must be uncompromising and unsparing.

Besides supervising the investigation in cooperation with the military governor, it will be your duty to examine the organization of the postal service, with its system of checks and balances, and report what greater or additional safeguards can be provided. Under the system established at the beginning of the American occupation of Cuba the administrative side of the service was placed under the control of this Department and the auditing or checking side under the control of another. This is the system of the United States Government. The irregularities and peculations which have been brought to light were apparently accomplished because officers appointed by and responsible to different Departments, and who should have been a check upon each other, entered into collusion and conspiracy to perpetrate these wrongs on the one side and to pass and cover them up on the other. You will carefully investigate by what defects of supervision or defense they were consummated, and what further measures of protection in the passing and auditing of accounts and in the handling of public funds and property may be needed.

It is desired also that the central organization of the postal service in Cuba shall receive your special attention. You will examine as to whether it is framed in the best manner for efficient administration. You will see whether, compatibly with a good mail service for the people, any retrenchments can be made, and whether economies can be effected by a consolidation and reduction of bureaus. It is desired to bring the postal expenditures within the postal revenues, so far as may be consistent with the obligation of providing a satisfactory mail service.

Your presence in Cuba as the representative of the Department, with these instructions, makes you the ranking officer of the postal administration. You will consider and advise what removals or other action may be required in the cause of justice, for the interest of the Government and of the people of Cuba, and for the welfare of the service.

You are chosen for this duty with the approval of the President, who is deeply shocked at the shameful betrayal of trust on the part of officials in whom confidence had been reposed, and who directs that in dealing with all irregularities which have been or may be disclosed the sole rule of action shall be thorough and complete investigation, the rigorous and unsparing prosecution of all guilty persons, and their swift and condign punishment.

You will communicate these instructions to General Wood, keeping him fully informed as you proceed, and reporting regularly to the Department.

Respectfully, yours,

CH. EMORY SMITH, Postmaster-General.

HON. JOSEPH L. BRISTOW,
Fourth Assistant Postmaster-General.

There speaks the President. He is "deeply shocked at the shameful betrayal of trust on the part of officials in whom confidence had been reposed," and he "directs that in dealing with all irregularities which have been or may be disclosed the sole rule of action shall be thorough and complete investigation, the rigorous and unsparing prosecution of all guilty persons, and their swift and condign punishment." But the Senator from Georgia thinks that really the Post-Office Department, the Executive Department, can not or will not make a thorough investigation of these wretched, shameful disclosures.

Mr. President, as I remarked a little while ago, the people of the country have confidence in William McKinley as President of the United States. I go a little further than that, and I aver that no President of the United States while holding the office of President ever had the confidence, the respect, the affection of the people to the extent which President McKinley has. Other Presidents have been canonized after their death; they have passed into history as entitled to confidence, respect, and love, but no President who, now dead, is thus respected, ever escaped in office the criticisms, the innuendoes, and the attacks which President McKinley has justly escaped.

Mr. President, the people of the country will be satisfied to leave this sad and shameful business in the hands of the Executive and his Cabinet. They well know that there will be no covering up of fraud, no condoning of crime, no toleration of irregularities. It is, therefore, that I think that these postal disclosures do not call at this time necessarily for a Senatorial investigation; but when it is

Department of the Province of Habana.—Commander: Maj. Gen. Fitzhugh Lee, December 30, 1898, to April 19, 1899. Adjutant-general: Lieut. Col. J. H. Dorst, December 30, 1898, to April 19, 1899. Chief quartermaster: Lieut. Col. G. E. Pond, December 30, 1898, to March 14, 1899; Maj. J. L. Wilson, March 14, 1899, to April 19, 1899.

14, 1899, to April 19, 1899. Chief commissary: Lieut. Col. O. E. Wood, January 24, 1899, to April 19, 1899. Chief surgeon: Lieut. Col. L. M. Maus, December 30, 1898, to February —, 1899; Maj. J. R. Kean, February 16, 1899, to April 19, 1899.

Department of Province of Habana and Pinar del Rio.—Commander: Brig. Gen. Fitzhugh Lee, April 19, 1899, to May 1, 1900. Adjutant-General: Maj. R. E. L. Michie, April 20, 1899, to May 1, 1900. Chief quartermaster: Maj. J. L. Wilson, April 20, 1899, to March 13, 1900. Chief commissary: Maj. O. E. Wood, April 20, 1899, to May 1, 1900. Inspector-general: Maj. R. B. Harrison, April 20, 1899, to April 8, 1900. Chief surgeon: Maj. J. R. Kean, April 20, 1899, to May 1, 1900. Disbursing officer, customs funds for the department: Maj. S. D. Sturgis, May 10, 1899, to August 11, 1899.

Department of Pinar del Rio.—Commander: Brig. Gen. G. W. Davis, January 3, 1899, to February 10, 1899; Brig. Gen. E. B. Williston, February 10, 1899, to March 20, 1899; Brig. Gen. H. C. Hasbrouck, March 20, 1899, to April 23, 1899. Adjutant-general: Maj. S. D. Sturgis, January 10, 1899, to April 23, 1899. Inspector-general: Maj. R. A. Brown, January 4, 1899, to March 31, 1899. Chief quartermaster: Maj. G. H. Sands, January —, 1899, to February 18, 1899; Lieut. Col. N. H. Creager, February 14, 1899, to April —, 1899 (remaining on duty at constructing quarters at Guanajay to September 8, 1899). Chief commissary: Capt. John Landstreet, January 3, 1899, to February 1, 1899; Maj. J. H. Heatwole, February 1, 1899, to April 22, 1899. Chief surgeon: Maj. William L. Kneeder, January 3, 1899, to June —, 1899.

Department of Matanzas.—Commander: Maj. Gen. J. H. Wilson, January 12, 1899, to April 21, 1899. Adjutant-general: Lieut. Col. G. R. Cecil, January 12, 1899, to April 21, 1899. Chief quartermaster: Lieut. Col. J. B. Aleshire, January 12, 1899, to April 21, 1899. Chief commissary: Maj. E. F. Taggart, January 12, 1899, to April 21, 1899. Chief surgeon: Lieut. Col. T. E. Wilcox, January 12, 1899, to March 20, 1899. Inspector-general: Lieut. Col. F. D. Baldwin, January 12, 1899, to April 21, 1899. Engineer officer: Lieut. Col. John Biddle, January 12, 1899, to April 21, 1899. District of Matanzas: Brig. Gen. J. P. Sanger, commanding, from January 13, 1899, to May 24, 1899.

Department of Santa Clara.—Commander: Maj. Gen. J. C. Bates, January 4, 1899, to April 19, 1899. Adjutant-general: Maj. L. V. Caziarc, January 11, 1899, to April 21, 1899. Chief quartermaster: Capt. S. A. Smokey, January 4, 1899, to March 21, 1899. Chief commissary: Maj. J. O. Varndoe, January 4, 1899, to March —, 1899. Chief surgeon: Maj. J. H. Hysell, January 4, 1899, to April 21, 1899. Provost-marshal: Maj. J. A. Logan, January 4, 1899, to February 25, 1899 (also acting military commandant judicial district of Sagua la Grande and Remedio).

Department of Puerto Principe.—Commander: Brig. Gen. L. H. Carpenter, January 10, 1899, to July 16, 1899. Adjutant-general: Capt. J. E. McMahon, January 24, 1899, to April 23, 1899; Capt. C. M. O'Connor, Eighth Cavalry, April 29, 1899, to June 19, 1899. Chief quartermaster: Capt. C. J. Symonds, January 10, 1899, to July 16, 1899 (being also disbursing officer for island custom funds). Chief commissary: Capt. W. M. Loveland, January 21, 1899, to April 6, 1899; Maj. Henry Page, April 6, 1899, to May —, 1899. Chief surgeon: Maj. S. T. Armstrong, January 10, 1899, to July 16, 1899.

Department of Santiago (designated Department of Santiago and Puerto Principe from July, 1899).—Commander: Brig. Gen. Leonard Wood, January 1, 1899, to December 20, 1899; Col. S. M. Whitside, Tenth Cavalry, January 22, 1900, to date. Adjutant-general: Lieut. Col. J. H. Beacom, January 1, 1899, to March 25, 1899; Maj. George Andrews, March 25, 1899, to date. Chief quartermaster: Maj. J. T. Knight, January 1, 1899, to July 1, 1899; Capt. C. M. Angur, July 1, 1899, to date. Chief commissary: Maj. E. T. Wilson, January 1, 1899, to May 18, 1899; Maj. J. H. Heatwole, May 18, 1899, to July 6, 1899; Capt. W. H. Beck, Tenth Cavalry, July 10, 1899, to September 15, 1899; Capt. T. F. Ryan, September 15, 1899, to date. Chief surgeon: Maj. V. Havard, January 1, 1899, to April —, 1900. Inspector-general: Maj. J. H. McLeary, February 11, 1899, to April 1, 1899. Judge-advocate: Maj. H. C. Carbaugh, February 10, 1899, to May 20, 1899; Maj. G. M. Dunn, May 20, 1899, to May —, 1900.

Department of Matanzas and Santa Clara.—Commander: Brig. Gen. J. H. Wilson, April 21, 1899, to date. Adjutant-general: Lieut. Col. G. R. Cecil, April 21, 1899, to May 23, 1899; Maj. J. H. Dorst, May 23, 1899, to August 19, 1899; Maj. E. St. J. Greble, September 19, 1899, to February 20, 1900. Inspector-general: Lieut. Col. F. D. Baldwin, April 21, 1899, to June 8, 1899; Maj. G. L. R. Brown, Tenth Infantry, September 25, 1899, to February —, 1900. Chief quartermaster: Lieut. Col. J. B. Aleshire, April 21, 1899, to June 30, 1899; Maj. W. H. Miller, June 30, 1899, to date. Chief commissary: Capt. M. R. Peterson, April 25, 1899, to date. Chief surgeon: Maj. F. J. Ives, April 25, 1899, to date. Judge-advocate, Maj. H. C. Carbaugh, May 29, 1899, to October 5, 1899.

OTHER OFFICERS THAT SERVED IN CUBA, IN COMMAND OF TROOPS, AS COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS, ETC.

Maj. Gen. J. W. Keifer, commanding First Division, Seventh Army Corps, at Habana, January 1, 1899, to March 11, 1899.

Brig. Gen. J. K. Arnold, commanding Second Division, Seventh Army Corps, at Habana, January 17, 1899, to April 12, 1899.

Brig. Gen. H. T. Douglas, commanding brigade, at Habana, January 7, 1899, to March 6, 1899.

Brig. Gen. E. P. Ewers, commanding district at San Luis, January 1, 1899, to March 23, 1899.

Maj. L. W. V. Kennon, assistant adjutant-general, on special duty at Headquarters Division of Cuba.

Capt. J. F. R. Landis, First Cavalry, collector of customs at Calbarien since January 5, 1899.

Capt. F. G. Irwin, jr., Second Cavalry, collector of customs at Manzanillo, May 1, 1899, to May 1, 1900, and on same duty at Santiago to date.

Capt. H. J. Slocum, Seventh Cavalry, disbursing officer Cuban customs funds at Habana, from August 12, 1899, to date.

Capt. E. A. Ellis, Eighth Cavalry, collector of customs at Guantanamo, since January 24, 1899.

First Lieut. A. E. Saxton, Eighth Cavalry, civil disbursing officer district of Santiago since August 14, 1899.

Second Lieut. H. A. Roberts, Eighth Cavalry, disbursing officer customs funds at Puerto Principe since December 9, 1899.

Capt. C. H. Grierson, Tenth Cavalry, disbursing officer at Santiago, Cuban census, September 25, 1899, to March 23, 1900.

First Lieut. H. C. Schumm, Second Artillery, collector of customs at Baracoa, January —, 1899, to April —, 1900.

Capt. John Conklin, jr., Fifth Artillery, collector of customs at Trinidad, December 30, 1898, to May —, 1900.

Capt. S. D. Freeman, Tenth Cavalry, collector of customs at Santiago, October 25, 1899, to May 1, 1900.

Capt. Elias Chandler, First Infantry, collector of Customs at Ysabella de Sagua since January 31, 1899.

First Lieut. L. S. Upton, Fifth Infantry, collector of customs at Manzanillo since May 5, 1899.

First Lieut. Preston Brown, Second Infantry, superintendent of street cleaning, Cienfuegos, June 29, 1899, to September 16, 1899.

Capt. W. Y. Stamper, Eighth Infantry, collector of customs at Cienfuegos, January 1, 1899, to February 19, 1900.

Second Lieut. J. W. Wright, Fifth Infantry, collector of customs at Baracoa since April 14, 1900.

First Lieut. M. B. Stokes, Tenth Infantry, collector of customs at Cardenas since June 22, 1899.

Maj. J. G. Davis, surgeon, chief sanitary officer, Habana, February 9, 1899, to February 10, 1900.

Maj. H. M. Lord, paymaster, in charge of and paying funds to Cuban army, June 3, 1899, to September 23, 1899.

Maj. J. J. Brereton, quartermaster, collector of customs at Cienfuegos, December 31, 1898, to May 11, 1899.

Capt. W. H. Hay, assistant quartermaster, collector of customs at Matanzas since December 29, 1898.

Capt. S. F. Dutton, A. C. S. Volunteers, disbursing officer, civil funds, Guanajay, February 14, 1899, to May 30, 1899.

H. C. CORBIN, *Adjutant-General.*

Mr. CHANDLER. May I ask the Senator whether any of the recent disclosures show that any officer of the Army has been guilty of fraud or dishonesty?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. There is nothing which has come to my attention to show that one cent has been improperly expended or appropriated by any military officer performing civil duties in the island of Cuba.

Mr. TILLMAN. Has the Senator from Connecticut had his attention called to the matter of the wharf for the railroad, built on the south side of the harbor?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Well, what of it?

Mr. TILLMAN. I just want to know if he has investigated it. I know nothing except what I have seen in the papers. I supposed the Senator would be able to give the Senate some information or light on the subject.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. If the Senator or anybody else has any charges to make in regard to that, I wish he would make them now.

Mr. TILLMAN. If the investigation is ordered, I will furnish some witnesses. I will agree to do that.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I think I will, having been interrupted, stop right here, breaking up the continuity of my remarks, for the purpose of saying one word about that railroad. I saw recently in a newspaper a statement that there had been some great frauds connected with the building of that railroad, and it took the shape which these other stories take, that there had been an unconscionable contract made; that the parties behind the contract were the former Secretary of War, Mr. Alger, and the two Senators from the State of New York, Senator DEWEY and Senator PLATT. If that is the charge, let us have it. I saw a statement, as quickly as the charge was promulgated, by the former Secretary of War that he had nothing whatever to do with it, and I saw a statement also made—and it was not necessary that he should make it—by the junior Senator from New York that he had nothing whatever to do with it. It was not necessary that he should say that. It was not necessary that the former Secretary of War should say it. It shows the recklessness of the people who are hunting stones to throw at this Administration.

When this war commenced we were told we were to have a carnival of corruption and extravagance. Our anti-expansion friends lamented over it in advance. The war has gone on; all the expenditures of the war have been made; and people anxious for campaign material have been scrutinizing them, and it comes down to this, that some men who were trusted and believed to be trustworthy have gone wrong in Cuba in postal affairs and have perhaps appropriated a hundred thousand dollars, more or less.

I am not going to stop to go into the question of the railroad at the present time. It was built before General Brooke took possession. It was built before there was a military governor in Cuba. It was built before General Wood was there. It was built under the quartermasters of the Army. It was built in haste. It was built to land troops and supplies and distribute them through the island, to avoid the pest holes where yellow fever bred, and the increased expense of transportation. I do not believe there was anything extravagant in it or any impropriety in the contract. I want to go a little further and say that, as I understand it, there has been no work performed under the military government in Cuba when performed by contract except with the same care as to advertisement and letting of bids that prevails in the United States when work is contracted for to be performed under the Engineer Corps of the Army.

Mud slinging is not proof, Mr. President. If there is any irregularity in Army circles or in any other circle of administration in Cuba, God knows I want to go to the bottom of it and have it exposed; but it is only just a little less reprehensible than wrongdoing of this character to attempt to seize upon it to cast discredit upon the Administration and upon the country which we all ought to support.

Mr. LODGE. I hope the Senator from Connecticut, before he leaves the matter of the railroad, will state, if he has the figures, what it actually cost. The statement has been made in the newspapers that it cost a million and a half. That I know is false, of course. I want to know how false it is.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. If I can lay my hands upon them, I think I have some figures here.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. I think it was in the neighborhood of \$190,000.

Mr. LODGE. That was my impression, but I was in hopes that the Senator from Connecticut would give us the exact statement.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. Aside from the land or the right of way.

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. BACON. I think I can furnish the Senator with the figures if he wishes them—\$342,611.84.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I will put in an extract from the report of the chief quartermaster, Division of Cuba, General Humphrey, of the expenditures on account of construction of military railroad, Triscornia, Cuba, including pier and amount paid for maintenance and repair. The first statement is up to August 30, and the second brings the cost up to September 30, 1899. The construction of the railroad and pier cost \$211,000, of which \$24,000 was for the pier. You can take \$24,000 from \$211,000, and that will give the total cost of construction. The road is about 7½ miles long. I will put in all these figures without reading them:

[Extract from report of chief quartermaster, division of Cuba, Habana, Cuba, August 30, 1899.]

Statement of expenditures on account of construction of military railroad, Triscornia, Cuba, including pier and amount paid for maintenance and repair.

| | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|
| For excavation..... | \$112,005.05 |
| For track laid and ballasted..... | 69,865.25 |
| For trestles..... | 5,287.27 |
| For pier..... | 24,414.17 |
| For engineering..... | 3,049.44 |
| Total for construction..... | 214,631.18 |
| For maintenance and repair: | |
| Labor..... | 13,713.25 |
| Miscellaneous tools and supplies..... | 3,869.23 |
| Total..... | 17,582.48 |

Respectfully submitted.

C. F. HUMPHREY,

Deputy Quartermaster-General, U. S. A., Chief Quartermaster.

WAR DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF CHIEF QUARTERMASTER,

DIVISION OF CUBA,

Habana, Cuba, November 20, 1899.

Statement of cost of construction, equipment, and maintenance of the military railroad piers and construction of warehouses at Triscornia, Cuba, up to and including September 30, 1899.

| | |
|---|--------------|
| Construction of railroad and pier (contract)..... | \$211,581.74 |
| Construction of switch connection with United Railways of Habana..... | 366.63 |
| Construction of semaphore; junction with United Railways of Habana..... | 80.12 |
| Piling at end of Pier No. 1..... | 725.04 |
| Construction of wharf for lighters (contract)..... | 12,900.00 |
| Construction of telegraph station..... | 175.00 |
| Construction of superintendent's office..... | 35.00 |
| Construction of water tank..... | 1,316.00 |
| Civil engineering (construction)..... | 6,512.37 |
| Two locomotives, at \$8,975 each..... | 17,950.00 |
| Cost unloading and setting up same..... | 475.57 |
| Twenty freight cars, at \$625 each..... | 12,500.00 |

Cost of railroad, including equipment, pier, and wharf..... \$264,617.47

WAREHOUSES.

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Construction of 7 warehouses (contract)..... | 39,900.00 |
| Construction of 3 platforms, connecting 4 of the above..... | 840.00 |
| Labor and material, painting warehouses..... | 630.30 |
| Putting new floor in old building on dock..... | 500.00 |

41,870.30

OPERATING, ADDITIONAL GRADING, BALLASTING, ETC.

| | |
|-----------------------------|-----------|
| Labor..... | 31,315.00 |
| Miscellaneous material..... | 4,809.07 |

Total..... 36,124.07

Grand total..... 342,611.84

Respectfully submitted.

Deputy Quartermaster-General, U. S. A., Chief Quartermaster.

A true copy.

C. F. HUMPHREY,

Deputy Quartermaster-General, U. S. A., Chief Quartermaster.

The entire expenditure as above has been reimbursed to the appropriations of the Quartermaster's Department, as follows:

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Army transportation, fiscal year 1900..... | \$17,778.68 |
| Regular supplies, fiscal year 1900..... | 3.20 |
| Regular supplies, fiscal year 1899..... | 17.00 |
| Barracks and quarters, fiscal year 1899..... | 41,450.00 |
| Army transportation, fiscal year 1899..... | 280,325.95 |
| Army transportation, January 1, 1899..... | 3,037.01 |

Total..... 342,611.84

It will be noted that the cost of constructing the railroad, \$211,581.74, included in the same contract the construction of a pier. Deducting the probable approximate cost of the pier, \$20,000, will leave for the construction proper of about 6 miles of railroad \$191,581.74, or about \$32,000 per mile. Considering the great difficulties under which the road was constructed, the imperative need for the utmost haste in the work, and the fact that all material and labor had to be transported from the United States, it would appear that the cost of this railroad was not in any way excessive.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. TILLMAN. I am seeking information. I should like to have the Senator state, if he has the information, by whose order

and upon whose recommendation this road and pier were built. Spain had been there for a good while and had got along without it; and we had a harbor down at Matanzas, I believe, that was accessible for shipping supplies or materials of war, if we needed any, westward toward Habana; and it is just a question as to whether the pier and road were needed at all, as we were there only temporarily and certainly did not propose to go into improvements of a permanent character. If the Senator has anything bearing on that phase of the question, I hope he will give it to us.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I suppose the Senator believes that Secretary Alger and Master of Transportation Hecker and Chief Quartermaster Humphrey really set to work to build this 7 miles of railroad for the purpose of giving somebody a fat contract and swindling the Government when the road was not necessary. I suppose the Senator from South Carolina really believes that.

Mr. TILLMAN. I wish the Senator, if he has anything on that line, would put it in, so that we may have the advantage of it. I know nothing except what I have seen and heard. There seems to be something fishy about it.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. You can hear and see fishy things if you desire.

Mr. CULBERSON. I should like to ask the Senator from Connecticut a question for information purely. That is, whether or not the \$211,000 includes the cost for right of way?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I do not think it does.

Mr. CULBERSON. How much did the right of way cost?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I do not know whether it cost anything. I believe there have been some claims made about it which are not yet adjusted. Of course I have not been so thoroughly into this matter that I profess to be an expert in the explanation of it. I have been far enough into it to understand that the Senator from Georgia was grossly misinformed when he suggested that it cost a million dollars.

Mr. BACON. Will the Senator please point to the place where I suggested that?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I will ask the Senator if he did not suggest it?

Mr. BACON. I certainly did not.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Even if he suggested it by way of illustration.

Mr. BACON. I at the same time disclaimed any knowledge of it.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. But when the speech goes out as a campaign document, the people will understand as they read it that the Senator intended to have it understood that it cost a million dollars.

Mr. BACON. I decline to have the Senator construe my language in direct opposition to what I said.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I hope I may be able to find it. [A pause.] This is what the Senator said:

Mr. President, it is alleged that there is a railroad built down there out of this money. The proper thing to do is not simply to receive a statement of facts that a million dollars have been used in the construction of a railroad. I am using that amount simply for illustration, not knowing what was the cost, although it is rumored that the cost was enormous.

That is what the Senator said. He did not say it cost a million dollars, but the people who read his speech will understand that he meant to have it understood that he thought it cost a million dollars.

Mr. CULLOM. Or some other enormous sum.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Or some other enormous sum.

Mr. BACON. I will say to the Senator—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Yes. I am not making this speech for campaign purposes, and therefore I will be more tolerant of interruption than the Senator from Georgia was.

Mr. BACON. I will satisfy the Senator, if he will pursue an investigation of this matter, that it is intended for something more than campaign purposes. What I wanted to say to the Senator is this: I had seen it stated in the papers that it was a million dollars, but I had no knowledge on the subject whatever, and therefore I was careful to say that I did not have it and that my information simply was that it was enormous; and that I stand by and expect to prove before I get through.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Before I was interrupted by Senators who seem to be troubled about the building of a railroad down in Cuba, which was said to be necessary and which I do not believe was undertaken by officers of the Army or the Secretary of War or anyone else for the purpose of giving a contract or a job or defrauding the Government of the United States, I had adverted to the care which had been used in the selection of military officers charged with the exercise of civil functions in Cuba; and notwithstanding the lamentable occurrences which followed the organization of the postal service in Cuba, I undertook to say that just the same care was exercised in the selection of officials who should have charge of and be employed in that

branch of the service as in the military department. It may be a question as to whether it was wise to organize what seemed to be a separate department of posts, whether it would not have been wiser to have placed the whole matter in the hands and under the control and immediate supervision of the military governors, Generals Brooke and Wood, but I think that the question was decided at the time according to the best light which could be obtained.

The postal system is especially one requiring technical knowledge and experience. In Cuba everything was chaotic; the postal affairs were conducted on archaic principles, like those in the earliest times of this Republic, in the days of Benjamin Franklin as Postmaster-General and the pony carrying of the mail, and when it was thought that we ought to give the people of Cuba while we remained there in administration a good service and a service modeled upon our own now magnificent and excellent service, it was the most natural thing in the world to suppose that we would—and if the newspapers' attention had then been called to it, they would have congratulated the President upon so determining—organize that department by the trained officials in the Post-Office Department.

Now, if that was to be done, if it was not to be organized and administered by Army officers, I insist that no better selection could have been made from the standpoint of that time and the knowledge which the Postmaster-General and the President of the United States supposed they possessed than was made. Who was Mr. Rathbone? If he has been guilty of any irregularity or any extravagance or any appropriation of moneys, there will be no disposition to shield him. The people will lament the fact, but they will pursue him unsparingly. Who was he? If those had been consulted who believe most in civil-service reform and merit appointments, where trained knowledge and experience and capacity and a good record are held to entitle one to be selected for office, they would have selected Estes G. Rathbone as the man to organize that department.

It is not the first time that men have gone wrong. It is not the first time that men employed in the management of banks and railroads and business affairs and educational organizations and churches who were trusted have gone wrong. Temptation is sometimes too strong to be resisted. But who was Mr. Rathbone? He was a man who had been educated in the Post-Office Department, whose first experience there, I think, was that of inspector, who had been employed in the Interior Department, if I am not mistaken, as inspector of the Interior Department, who, when Benjamin Harrison came to be President of the United States was for his merit selected by President Harrison to be Fourth Assistant Postmaster-General, and the office was created for him. Could there have been greater care exercised in the selection of a man? Will Senators who are familiar with people who have had post-office experience and technical training and who understand the postal system of the United States point out now some man whom they think would have been a better man to select, from all the knowledge which the people and the office and the Administration had at that time, than Estes G. Rathbone? If he has fallen—and nobody knows yet that he has; if he has appropriated money—and nobody knows yet that he has—

Mr. CHANDLER. Will the Senator allow me? Is there any evidence that Mr. Rathbone has been anything but unsuccessful in his administration? Is there any charge that he has appropriated money?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. None that I know of.

Mr. BACON. If the Senator will pardon me in that connection, there was certainly published in the public press what was represented to be an interview with the Postmaster-General, who admitted the fact that Mr. Rathbone had taken the public funds in Cuba and applied them to the purchase of personal apparel, to say nothing of other uses to which he had put such funds. How true that is I do not know. The Senator asked whether there was any such charge. I say there has been such a charge in the public press, and that the Postmaster-General is represented in that public press in a public interview to have said that it was true that Mr. Rathbone had used some of the money in the purchase of personal apparel.

Mr. CHANDLER. I remember, now, seeing the statement as to the apparel, but when the Senator from Connecticut alluded to Mr. Rathbone as having gone wrong, it occurred to me that I had not seen any charge against Mr. Rathbone except that all these defalcations had occurred under his administration, where he had given to him such extensive powers. He certainly has been unfortunate in results, and therefore was relieved, as a general might well be relieved who had failed to win a battle.

Mr. BACON. The Senator will not understand me as saying that that is true of Mr. Rathbone. I do not know it. But the Senator asked the question whether there had been any such charge, and the Senator from Connecticut replied that so far as he knew there had been none. I simply point out the fact, not that it is true, that it has been so charged in the public press, and that the Postmaster-General himself is represented as having

said in an interview that it was true; and there has been no denial of the authenticity of that interview.

Mr. CHANDLER. Has there been any charge against him of having received money?

Mr. BACON. Of what?

Mr. CHANDLER. Of having received the money of the Government dishonestly?

Mr. BACON. There is a charge of having used money of the Government in the most extravagant and riotous living—in cutting a figure socially—as was expressed in the paper, which was only second to that of him who is called the Governor-General; that he had appropriated over \$3,000 to the renting of a house for himself to live in; that he had used money in the purchase of personal apparel; that a Cuban clerk accustomed to the misappropriations of Spanish officials was so shocked by it that he would not draw the papers necessary to put it in the shape of a warrant, and that it had to be transferred to another clerk who would do it, and it was done.

I repeat I do not say that there is a single word of truth in any of that, because I do not know it, but the Senator wanted to know if there had been any charges. I simply tell him that it was charged not only on the streets but in the public press of this city.

Mr. CHANDLER. I am obliged to the Senator for giving me the information. I remember now seeing those general statements about Mr. Rathbone. The particular point to which I want to call attention, inasmuch as some of the postal officials have been stealing money, cash, is that I believe it has not been charged that Mr. Rathbone has directly taken any money of the Government.

Mr. BACON. I hope it may be found that he has not.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I was proceeding to say when I was interrupted—and it always happens that when a Senator is making rather a telling point he is interrupted—that from the standpoint at the time of his selection no better man could have been selected for this office than Mr. Rathbone; and if he has fallen, we lament it, but shall not condone it. If there is any irregularity or misappropriation of money, or if he has charged anything of his own personal expense to the Cuban revenues which ought not to be charged to the Cuban revenues, it will be found out and summary justice will be meted out. It was an appointment which by civil-service reformers would be called a merit appointment and not a spoils appointment. I know newspapers have tried to give that impression, and I find in the New York World of May 21 a scare headline which says, "Cuba's postal head said to boast that they dare not remove him." I find on the same day this order relieving him, which I will ask to have put in the RECORD:

WASHINGTON, May 21, 1900.

Ordered, That Estes G. Rathbone be, and he is hereby, suspended from the office of director-general of posts of Cuba; that Joseph L. Bristow, Fourth Assistant Postmaster-General, be, and he is hereby, appointed acting director-general of posts of Cuba, without other salary than that of Fourth Assistant Postmaster-General; that all records, books, papers, supplies, and other properties of the department of posts of Cuba shall be immediately delivered to the custody of the acting director-general of posts hereby appointed.

CHARLES EMORY SMITH,

Postmaster-General.

What else was done? I will not go into the outlining of the plan upon which the postal system was organized in Cuba. I will only say that anybody in the administration of the affairs of this Government, called upon to administer the affairs of Cuba, would have felt impelled to organize there a complete and efficient postal service, modeled as nearly as possible upon the service of the United States. That was done. I shall have a word to say hereafter perhaps about the power which was given Mr. Rathbone. He was selected, as I said, as Fourth Assistant Postmaster-General and served for four years. The plan which was adopted was this: That all the accounts of the post-office system in Cuba should be audited by some one not connected with the postal service—should be audited by some one connected with the Treasury Department—as the accounts of the Post-Office Department in our own Government are audited under the Treasury Department, and by the Sixth Auditor of the Treasury Department.

For the auditing of those accounts Mr. Lawshe, the Deputy Auditor of the Treasury for the Post-Office Department, a most rigid and unbending officer, was detailed by the Secretary of the Treasury to go to Cuba, where he remained two months, organizing the auditor's office and system. No more thorough man could have been named for that duty. If Senators who desire this investigation had been seeking for a man to organize the auditing department for the post-office system in Cuba, to whom would they have gone rather than the Deputy Sixth Auditor, who had charge of auditing the postal accounts of the United States? He remained there two months, organizing the auditor's office and assisting, when he returned to take charge of his duties in the Post-Office Department at Washington. Mr. Reeves, who since 1888 had been a trained and experienced clerk in the office of the Sixth Auditor and engaged in the auditing of postal accounts, was sent down there to take the place of auditor. Would a civil-service

reformer have been able to select a man more likely to meet their ideas of efficiency and merit than to take this clerk who had been trained in that Department and that office here in Washington?

Now, as to Mr. Neely. I do not know that Mr. Neely had had any previous experience in the Department. He was sent as a clerk to assist General Rathbone. He had the confidence of all the people who knew him in Indiana. I can say that without fear of contradiction. His integrity had never been questioned. I will repeat it in the hearing of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. FAIRBANKS], who has just come to his seat. I think that Mr. Neely before he went to Cuba had the confidence and respect of all people who knew him in the State of Indiana. That is his reputation. He went there as a clerk at \$1,800, and he showed such capacity there that he was put in charge of the finances; and then how it happened we do not know. How it happens that a cashier of a bank goes wrong, how it happens that the treasurer of a college goes wrong, how it happens that anybody goes wrong, we do not know. But these men, Neely and Reeves, went wrong, appropriated Cuban postal funds, and have brought disgrace and humiliation and shame and reproach upon the country—not upon the Administration so much as upon the country, which had assumed the honest, upright, and economical administration of the affairs of Cuba while Cuba remained in our possession.

Other men have been sent from the Post-Office Department. I will give a list of them. I will not stop to read it, but whoever does read it will see that great care has been taken to select persons not only of experience, training, and technical knowledge, but persons supposed to be of the highest integrity:

From office of First Assistant Postmaster-General, to establish a money-order system: Edward M. Gadsden, late chief clerk money-order system; date of original appointment July 26, 1884. Frank E. Waring, clerk, money-order system; date of original appointment August 6, 1885. To establish a dead-letter office: Charles N. Dalzell, clerk of class \$1,800, originally appointed March 27, 1880; William E. Corbin, clerk of class \$1,000, originally appointed January 6, 1880.

From office of Second Assistant Postmaster-General, to establish bureau of transportation and railway mail service, nine railway postal clerks of long experience in the home service.

From office of Third Assistant Postmaster-General: F. A. Barbour, clerk, originally appointed in Department December 30, 1884.

From office of Fourth Assistant Postmaster-General, to assist in general organization, four post-office inspectors: Lawrence Leatherman, appointed originally July 9, 1890, served in Cuba from February 9 to May 28, 1899; William T. Sullivan, appointed originally April 21, 1897, served in Cuba from February 10 to May 28, 1899; James W. Erwin, appointed originally June 27, 1887, served in Cuba from February 10 to April 23, 1899; A. O. Swift, appointed originally January 2, 1890, served in Cuba from March 27 to June 2, 1899.

A committee was appointed for the purpose of selecting men best qualified to discharge those duties efficiently, and I will give the names of that committee:

August W. Machen, Superintendent of the Free Delivery System since May 6, 1893.

Albert W. Bingham, chief of the finance division, Post-Office Department; date of original appointment in Department, March 20, 1866.

John M. Masten, assistant superintendent Railway Mail Service; originally appointed in the service in 1880.

Martin C. Fosnes, post-office inspector; date of original appointment, December 19, 1890.

Martin A. MacDonald, secretary, a clerk in the office of the Second Assistant Postmaster-General; originally appointed in the service August 17, 1886.

Now, there is one other thing which I ought to notice. Great stress has been laid upon the fact that extra allowances have been made to the military governor of Cuba and to others who have been performing civil functions in the island of Cuba. I doubt whether any real complaint has been made that those allowances, or extra salary, if you please to call it extra salary, were unnecessary. I think the Senator from Georgia in his speech said that he did not make that charge, but that they were illegal. The allowances now in force by the report of the Adjutant-General of the Army were for the military governor of Cuba, \$7,500 a year; the military governor of Habana, \$5,000 a year; the collector of customs, \$1,800, and the treasurer of the island of Cuba, \$1,800; and those are all.

Those allowances were necessary unless we propose to treat our officers in Cuba charged with the administration of civil affairs with a parsimony and meanness which, to use the language of the Senator from Georgia, would bring the blush of shame to the cheek of every American citizen.

The American people do not want the Governor-General of Cuba to live out in the suburbs in a one-story house and walk in the hot sun to his duties in the city, and transact his business on the sidewalk, nor do they want him to pay the necessary expenses incidental to the proper performance of the duties of that office out of his own pocket or his own salary. I am not going to stop to discuss that question, but as to the question of legality I will say a word. It has been charged that these allowances were illegal, because there is a statute, section 1269, which provides that—

No allowances shall be made to officers in addition to their pay except as hereinafter provided.

I am quoting from the speech of the Senator from Georgia. I now have the statute here, and his citation is correct.

Then it goes on to refer to fuel, quarters and forage, forage in kind, forage to officers, traveling pay under orders, etc.

Now, Mr. President, it is perfectly plain that that refers to pay and allowances of Army officers out of funds of the United States and from appropriations made of United States money, and that alone. More than that, it refers to their pay for the discharge of their strictly military duties, duties discharged in the line of duty and as military officers pure and simple. Whenever a military officer has been called upon to perform civil functions in the United States, it has been customary by statute to increase his pay. I think I may make the statement without fear of contradiction and without qualification that whenever an officer of the Army has been called upon by law in the United States to perform civil functions, provision has been made for extra payment on account of those civil functions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut will suspend for a moment. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, it is the duty of the Chair to lay before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 2355) in relation to the suppression of insurrection in, and to the government of, the Philippine Islands, ceded by Spain to the United States by the treaty concluded at Paris on the 10th day of December, 1898.

Mr. SPOONER. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside to enable the Senator from Connecticut to finish his remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside to enable the Senator from Connecticut to finish his remarks. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Mr. President, such is the case with reference to the engineer officer of the District of Columbia and a variety of officers who are called upon by law to perform civil offices in addition to their military duties. So the principle of the thing is not attacked. That was true with regard to our officers in Mexico. At the time of the Mexican war General Scott collected large amounts of money by way of contributions from the enemy and allowed the officers who had charge of those contributions a commission, and paid out \$50,000 himself as a secret-service fund. Statutes were passed authorizing all this.

Now, it was not necessary to have any statute before or after these allowances in Cuba to these officers. The people of the United States are not going to condemn these allowances from principle. They are not going to say that the officers there ought to have been required to pay out of their own salary or their private funds the expenses which they were forced to incur in the discharge of these offices; not at all. The point is merely technical, and if the reply is technical, it is because the charge and allegation are technical. These are not revenues of the United States out of which these allowances have been made. These officers are not paid out of the revenues of the United States. They are paid, as they should be paid, out of the revenues of the island of Cuba, for their services are for the benefit of the people of Cuba, and the people of Cuba have not complained.

What complaint has come from Cuba that these allowances were improper? The Cubans have been accustomed to a Governor-General who had a salary of \$15,000 and an allowance of \$30,000—\$45,000—and when they saw that the pay and allowance of the Governor-General sent there by the United States was fixed at only \$15,000, they thought it was a very moderate sum to be paid to the Governor-General of Cuba. There has been no complaint in Cuba. The whole question as to whether these allowances could be properly made depends upon whether the military governor—which means the President of the United States and those under him in military authority—can direct the expenditure of the Cuban revenues. Is there any question about that?

Is it seriously contended that the President of the United States and the Secretary of War under him, and others to whom he may properly delegate the authority, can not control and direct the expenditure of money while we are in possession of the island of Cuba? You may say it is extravagant, if you will, but do you say it is unlawful? I have no doubt that it was both proper and lawful, and that the people of the United States will have little trouble about this item which the Senator from Georgia thinks calls so loudly for investigation by a Senatorial committee.

But the Senator from Georgia, having dished up newspaper rumors and become responsible for them and the other rumors which he had heard somewhere but admits he does not know anything about, says there is one thing which surely requires investigation, and that is the extravagant expenditures of Cuban money, and he told us that in the first year we had collected \$16,346,015.17, and that we had expended \$14,085,805.32; and he says that this is proof in itself of extravagance, if not corruption, and of gross misappropriation of funds and plundering the people

of Cuba. Then he goes on to prove it by reference to the expenditures for State purposes of the different States, his own State among them, and he gives us a list of States where he says the expenditures are very much less than in Cuba.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, I do not like to interrupt him, but he misrepresents me, and I certainly ought to correct him. The Senator can not find where I said that these things were as charged. I simply said that they were charged, and that being charged by reputable witnesses and appearing in reputable journals, the duty of investigation followed. I would have thought it would have been as improper for me to say in advance that they were true as, if I were otherwise situated, I would think it improper for me to say they were untrue before I had investigated them, especially if I was going to be charged with the duty of investigation.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. The Senator read from the Washington Post principally, and though I am not able to turn to it now, he admitted that by reading it he accepted it as true.

Mr. BACON. The Senator is mistaken.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Well, it is here in the speech.

Mr. BACON. I can find it, but I recollect very distinctly what I said without finding it. I said that by reading it I gave—

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Here it is.

Mr. BACON. Very well; read it.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. The Senator said:

I am reading still from the narrative in the Washington Post, and of course, in reading it, I necessarily assume the position of giving it credence and saying that I believe it to be true.

Mr. BACON. Certainly. That is a very different thing from saying it is true.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. And the Senator does not think that is a charge at all?

Mr. BACON. I do not say that at all; on the contrary, I say it is just as a grand jury makes a charge, or a person swearing out a warrant makes a charge for trial, in order that the truth may be ascertained.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Well, here is one thing that the Senator said called for investigation. He claims that this rests upon figures:

I say again, Mr. President, that if we had no information of the improper expenditure of any money in Cuba, if we had no rumor that there had been any money improperly expended in Cuba, if we simply had the naked fact that in the year 1899 the officers, civil and military, of the United States Government had collected over \$16,000,000 in Cuba, and that they had expended over \$14,000,000—I say that simple fact would be so startling in its nature as to demand on the part of Congress an investigation to ascertain whether or not that money had been properly, prudently, honestly, and economically disbursed.

Then he goes on to give the items of expenditure from the report of the Secretary of War, and then he proves and clinches his contention, as he supposes, by telling what the States expend, and he gives an illustration from several States. The State of Georgia, where he says that only \$2,900,000 are spent, and Indiana—

Mr. BACON. Less than a million dollars, if the Senator will pardon me, for the ordinary current expenses.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Well, the total expenses were \$2,930,000, and in Indiana the total expenditures were five million and a half dollars; in Minnesota the total expenditures were six and a half million dollars. Then he comes to Connecticut. The total expenditures were \$2,530,280.33; of this, for education, \$633,729.67; for ordinary support of the State, including public debt, \$896,000.

Mr. BACON. I call the attention of the Senator to the fact that there is a typographical error there. That ought to be "eighteen hundred thousand." The subtraction shows it. The figures themselves show that instead of \$896,000 it ought to be \$1,896,000 in the case of Connecticut.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. As the Senator made these statements they were rather startling. If the expenditure in Cuba was \$14,000,000 during the year of 1899, and the whole expenditure of the State of Georgia was only \$2,900,000, and the whole expenditure of the State of Connecticut was only two and a half million dollars, and the whole expenditure of the State of Minnesota was only \$6,000,000, there would be some color to the argument which the Senator makes, that there had been extravagant and unwarranted expenditure in the island of Cuba. But the Senator utterly and absolutely ignored the fact that the instances which he was giving were only instances of State expenditures pure and simple, and did not include in any way expenditures for national and municipal government. Take the State of Massachusetts. He says that the expenditure of the entire State of Massachusetts, with nearly 3,000,000 inhabitants, were only \$9,000,000. He forgot to state that in the city of Boston the municipal expenditures were over \$20,000,000. He forgot to state that in Cuba all expenses of government, of what may be called national and state government and municipal government and local government, that every possible expenditure made under either of these heads was paid out of the Cuban revenues.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President—

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Was that fair, Mr. President?

Mr. BACON. If the Senator will pardon me, he is most mistaken as to what I said. Fortunately what I said is in print. So far from the Senator having a right to use the strong language of his own, that I ignored it, on the contrary, if the Senator will look at the speech and at the colloquy had between the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] and myself, and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] and myself, the Senator will see that I deducted from the gross total of Cuban expenses the item which they had for municipal expenses. Therefore in the comparison the fact that there is no item of municipal expenses in the State statements made the thing equal and fair.

One word further. In order to put the matter beyond dispute, I even conceded, for the sake of the argument (the Senator will find it in the RECORD), that the unnamed expenses of a State in the State tabulation should represent 50 per cent of the total expenses in Cuba outside of the municipal expenses, and that there would still be over \$7,000,000 for the ordinary expenses in Cuba as compared with the States, no one of which had made any such expenditure for its government, even after all the expenses to which the Senator now alludes had been eliminated and excluded from the calculation. The Senator says that I ignored it. On the contrary, I most carefully stated it and took it into account.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. The Senator ignored it until his attention was called to it, and then admitted it. But he utterly failed to allude to other items which were just as much entitled to be considered as the matter of payment to municipalities.

The truth is that in Cuba all expenses, postal expenses—States do not pay postal expenses—all expenses of public works, all expenses of municipal government, all expenses of local government, all expenses of sanitation, all expenses of rural guards and police, are paid out of the Cuban revenues under the direction of the military governor. When you come to consider that fact, the case is not made out.

The Senator might have taken the District of Columbia as a fair illustration. There are a million and a half people in Cuba, twice as many as there are in the State of Connecticut, and I think our expenditures in the State of Connecticut, including State expenditures and local and municipal taxation, must be \$10,000,000 a year. I think, with half the population of Cuba, we expend nearly as much as has been expended in Cuba; and Connecticut is an old State. There is no reconstruction there, no pestilence there to be avoided; there is no building up from the ground. If they had spent money in Cuba the way it is spent in Connecticut, there would have been an expenditure of \$20,000,000 instead of \$14,000,000.

The Senator from Georgia might have taken the District of Columbia for an example. I think the last District of Columbia appropriation bill, which we have just passed, carries over \$7,000,000. That does not pay for the erection of public buildings nor the running of post-offices.

Mr. BACON. This is the national capital.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Well, Habana is the national capital of Cuba. Over \$7,000,000 are appropriated for the District of Columbia. How many inhabitants have they here? They had about 230,000 I think in the last census; they may have 280,000 or 300,000 here now. There was a million and a half in Cuba. We do not pay for filling up flats and the building of memorial bridges and public buildings or anything of that kind. This \$7,000,000 does not pay for postal expenses. We have about 69 square miles here. They have about 44,000 square miles in Cuba. Suppose I were to argue along the line which the Senator from Georgia argues, that because they had four times as much population in Cuba as we have in the District of Columbia and many times the square miles they ought to spend four times as much money in Cuba as they do in the District of Columbia. Four times seven millions would be \$28,000,000 that would then have been properly expended in the island of Cuba. Perhaps I am spending too much time upon this subject, but as it was so much dwelt upon by the Senator from Georgia I think a little examination of it is entirely proper.

What was the condition of Cuba when we took it? What does General Brooke say? He says there was a starving and dying people there; that it was the home of yellow fever, as India is the home of cholera and the plague.

Mr. President, as long ago as 1762, I think it was, and perhaps it was earlier than that, we sent down a regiment from Connecticut to assist the English in reducing Habana, and that regiment never came home. It perished with the yellow fever. From that day to this Habana has been the fear of the United States as a home of yellow fever.

We spent how much in sanitation in Cuba? We spent there in sanitation \$3,052,000. Was that improperly expended? All this Southern country, which the Senator from Georgia represents, has lived in mortal dread and fear of yellow fever imported from Habana; every Southern port is quarantined against it now, and

there has not been a fatal case there in the last month. I find in a paper this morning this extract:

Surgeon-General Sternberg has received a report from Maj. W. C. Gorgar, of the Medical Corps, chief sanitary officer of Habana, in which he says that while the death rate for April was 482, there were no deaths from yellow fever, the first month so favored since May, 1899, and the only month when there were no deaths from this disease during the past ten years, with two exceptions, February and May, 1899.

This military government, which is so criticised and charged with extravagance, has been extravagant, if at all, in stamping out pestilence and death and taking care of starving and dying people. I wish I had the speech of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROCTOR], delivered here just before we engaged in this war, showing the condition of the reconcentrados. We came to a heritage of death and pestilence in Cuba, and we met the situation. There is no distress there now; there is no epidemic of disease there now. Habana is as healthy as New Orleans; and it is all to the credit of this military government there, which is a better government than they have before had and they know it, and if they succeed, when they set up a government for themselves, in establishing and maintaining a government under which they will have as much of peace and prosperity and happiness as they have had under this government, they will be entirely content.

Mr. FAIRBANKS. With the Senator's permission, I wish simply to call his attention to a report of General Wood, when governor of Santiago, in which he makes the statement that the death rate had been reduced there, at a conservative estimate, fully 40 per cent.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I see this dispatch, too, from Habana in a paper this morning:

SALARIES PAID IN CUBA—NO PRESENT MEANS OF MAKING MUNICIPALITIES SELF-SUPPORTING.

HABANA, May 22, 1900.

The amount paid in salaries in Cuba can not be compared with the outlay for any Territory of corresponding size and population in the United States. Here the entire municipal charges, including expenditure for police and jails, are paid out of the island's funds, as at present no means exists of making the municipalities self-supporting.

During the latter part of 1898 General Wood had organized the municipal taxes of Santiago in such a way that these would entirely cover expenses, leaving a margin for civic improvements; but when the entire island came under the American régime he received orders not to collect the taxes. Now the difficulties in the way are much greater than they would have been at the beginning. Nevertheless, General Wood has hopes that after the elections most of the municipalities can be made self-supporting.

Mr. President, perhaps I have dwelt too long upon this matter. There was one other subject referred to by the Senator from Georgia, which he says is the most important of all. It may be summed up in a word. He wants to know what we are doing in Cuba, why we are there, what our authority is to be there, and why we do not come away. Well, we are there because the American people sent us there, sent the Army there. We are there because the American people, acting through Congress, directed the President of the United States, as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, to go to Cuba and destroy the power of Spain there. That is why we are there.

I agree that the situation in Cuba is unique, that history does not furnish a parallel, that no precisely similar case has been treated by writers upon international law, that our relations there must be determined upon general principles and the necessity of the situation.

Mr. President, I was not in favor of the war with Spain. I believed that it might have been avoided with honor and with the security of freedom to the island of Cuba. But the American people said "No;" and when, by accident or design, the good ship *Maine*, with its American sailors on board, was blown into the air, and its sailors found a grave in the harbor of Habana, there was no power on earth that could prevent the war. When that war was declared, I accepted the consequences. I thought I saw then more clearly than a good many of the people who were urging us on in hot haste to engage in war. I thought I saw that if we turned Spain out of Cuba we would become responsible not only to Spain and the Cuban people, but to ourselves and to the whole world for the proper administration of the affairs of Cuba and the erection of a proper republican government there. We have a duty to perform in Cuba yet, as we had a supposed duty to perform when we went there to free the people of Cuba. That duty is not yet discharged. The American people will see to it that that duty is fully and completely discharged, as much as they saw that its performance was begun.

What is that duty? It is said that our only right to be in Cuba is because in the resolution of intervention the fourth paragraph said this:

Fourth. That the United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said island except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination, when that is accomplished, to leave the government and control of the island to its people.

It is said that is our only warrant for being there; that we are self-constituted agents for the purpose of the pacification of the island, with a duty to leave the moment that pacification is accom-

plished. Well, there is a little more than that, Mr. President. We went to war with Spain, and we had conquered a portion of the island of Cuba. The American people do not forget El Caney, San Juan, and Santiago. They do not forget so easily the achievements of our Navy. There was war with Spain, and a portion of Spain was conquered. Then we had a preliminary treaty of peace, and by that treaty of peace we came, as the conquerors, into possession of the island of Cuba, and by that treaty of peace we agreed to do something, too. Article I of that treaty says:

ARTICLE I. Spain relinquishes all claim of sovereignty over and title to Cuba.

And as the island is, upon its evacuation by Spain, to be occupied by the United States, the United States will, so long as such occupation shall last, assume and discharge the obligations that may under international law result from the fact of its occupation, for the protection of life and property.

That was our agreement with Spain. Why did we make it? Because the ambassador of France, in negotiating the protocol, insisted upon it. I read from a letter addressed to the Secretary of State by Duke Almodovar del Rio, minister of state of Spain, taken up afterwards by Ambassador Cambon. He says this:

The necessity of withdrawing from the territory of Cuba being imperative, the nation assuming Spain's place must, as long as this territory shall not have fully reached the conditions required to take rank among other sovereign powers, provide for rules which will insure order and protect against all risks the Spanish residents as well as the Cuban natives still loyal to the mother country.

That is why that was inserted in the treaty of peace with Spain.

What was the occupancy that was referred to in that treaty? It was a military occupancy. What was the protection which was to be given under international law and the obligations that were to be discharged under international law? They were obligations that resulted from military occupation for the protection of life and property.

Now, put the two things together, Mr. President. Up to the time of the evacuation by Spain our occupancy was a military occupancy, and was so recognized by the treaty. When the evacuation was made and the property turned over to us, it was turned over to the military authorities. When did that occupation cease to be a military occupancy? The Senator from Georgia acknowledges that the original occupation was a military occupancy. When did it cease to be a military occupancy, and when will it cease to be a military occupancy? It will cease to be a military occupancy when, under that military occupancy, an opportunity shall have been given to the people of Cuba to set up for themselves a government to which we may turn over the island and to which we may leave the government and control of the island.

What does "pacification" mean in that clause? Does it mean merely the establishment of nominal and formal peace? Does it mean that so soon as hostilities ceased our troops were to be withdrawn and the island left to all the contentions and factions which existed there? No, Mr. President; we became responsible for something else than mere nominal peace in the island of Cuba. We became responsible for the establishment of a government there, which we would be willing to indorse to the people of the world—a stable government, a government for which we would be willing to be responsible in the eyes of the world. Until that time occurs, no patriotic American will ask that our troops and our Government be withdrawn from the island of Cuba.

Mr. BACON. Will the Senator kindly state when that time will arrive?

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. Mr. President, it is easy to ask questions of that sort. Anybody can ask questions. That time will be delayed long, perhaps, if a party, for party purposes, makes the work of bringing it to a conclusion more difficult. That is what I complain of. The blush of shame ought to mantle the cheeks of every man who strives to hinder or to embarrass the operations of Governor-General Wood in the island of Cuba, seeking to bring about that time as rapidly and as quickly as it may be brought about.

Mr. President, what has been done? What would Senators have done that has not been done? As I said, we took Cuba in a chaotic condition. General Brooke is authority for that. It is a matter of common knowledge. We can take judicial knowledge of the fact that we took Cuba without government, with chaos and incipient anarchy there, and we brought order out of chaos. We now have peace and quiet and prosperity there.

Why has not a government been set up there? How could it have been earlier set up? By the treaty with Spain the Spanish inhabitants were given until the 11th of April in this year to register and preserve their allegiance to Spain. Until that time nobody knew who was entitled to take part in the setting up of a new government.

Then came the census, which was just as essential and just as necessary in order to ascertain who had the right to participate in the setting up of a new government, and it was hoped that would be accomplished at the same time that was fixed for the registration of Spanish citizens on the 11th of April; and it came pretty near it. The work was well done, promptly done, and quickly done, but there was a little delay on that account.

Then came the fixing of the suffrage to determine the right of the people to participate in the election. That had to be done, had it not? Then came the election, the choice of registration officers. That had to be done, had it not? Then the municipal elections, the first step toward the establishment of a national government, now set for the 18th of June. Do Senators think it could have been done earlier, more quickly, more expeditiously? Do Senators think that the government for which we are charged with the responsibility, could have been inaugurated by town meetings and gatherings in the street, inaugurated after the fashion of Spanish pronunciamientos, dictators calling themselves presidents? Perhaps they regret that we have not suffered such a republic to be established there as was said to have been established by Aguinaldo in the Philippines. That could have been done quickly.

Mr. President, we could have withdrawn our troops; but that was not what we were called upon to do; that was not the task which honor, national obligation, justice to ourselves, to the people of Cuba, and responsibility to the world has set before us. And, Mr. President, we shall see to it that when it is established it will be a government which we can indorse to the nations of the world, a government which will maintain all international obligations, and which, if it be necessary, we will stand behind to enable it to maintain all international obligations.

It is not the work of a moment, Mr. President; but it will not take long. The work is being conducted as rapidly as is possible under the circumstances, and with reference to the kind of work to be performed. The haste is in the United States, not in Cuba. The Cuban people are satisfied that the work is progressing properly, judiciously, and that the independence and self-government which has been promised to them will be established and confirmed to them. It is people in the United States who want campaign material, who want to cast discredit upon the Administration, who think Mr. Bryan can do this thing better than can President McKinley—these people are getting impatient; but they will not succeed, in my judgment, in disturbing the confidence of the people of the United States.

Mr. President, I have spoken longer than I intended on this subject. I repeat what I said at first, that the charges by way of insinuation, innuendo, rumor, scandal, and mud throwing, have made it necessary that this investigation should go on; and whatever of personal discomfort may be encountered. I am willing to accept it, and, so far as I am concerned, to promise that nothing shall be covered up; that everything shall be brought to the light of day; that the keen sunlight of publicity shall be turned upon the administration in Cuba; and, Mr. President, I entertain a confidence, which is not to be shaken until the facts shall shake it, that when that investigation has been concluded it will definitely appear that we have been regaled with grossest exaggerations and with the most uncalled for suspicions; and that we shall find that our Army officers now, as ever, can be trusted, and are honest and upright, and that our civil officers may also be trusted as upright men, although it unfortunately appears that some of them have now gone so wickedly and lamentably astray.

I had prepared a proposed amendment to give the resolution life and vitality. As it was drawn, of course nothing could be done under it. The Senator from Georgia yesterday submitted an amendment, which he proposes to offer, very much in the line of an amendment which I myself had prepared. I think I would accept the amendment of the Senator from Georgia with one or two words changed in it. I would want authority to employ expert accountants, particularly.

Mr. BACON. I am perfectly satisfied with that.

Mr. PLATT of Connecticut. I shall offer at the proper time the following amendment to the resolution:

Said committee is authorized to conduct said investigation, and make such report by subcommittee or committees appointed by the chairman; and the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit during the recess of Congress at such place or places in the United States or Cuba as may be necessary; and is empowered to send for persons and papers, issue subpoenas, administer oaths, examine witnesses, employ stenographers, expert accountants, and other necessary assistance, and the expenses of said investigation shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. BACON. Before the Senator from Wisconsin proceeds, I wish to make a statement. I had previously, at the suggestion of Senators on the other side of the Chamber, agreed—in fact I had upon my own motion stated to them—that I would not ask the Senator from Wisconsin to yield further than he has already done in permitting the Senator from Connecticut to conclude his remarks, and at their suggestion I intended to do what I now do—ask that I may be allowed to proceed to-morrow morning immediately after the conclusion of the morning business. I think I would be entitled to do so anyhow under the order which has been previously given, making the resolution subject to my call; but I prefer to make it in the shape of a request that I may have unanimous consent then to proceed. If that is the understanding, all right.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HAWLEY submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8582) making appropriations for the support of the Regular and Volunteer Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 16 and 47. That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 45, 46, and 48, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter inserted by the Senate amendment, and in lieu of the matter stricken out insert the following: "For the purpose of connecting headquarters, Department of Alaska, at St. Michael, by military telegraph and cable lines with other military stations in Alaska, \$450,550;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out of the matter inserted by said amendment, after the word "owned," the following: "wholly or in part;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out all of the matter inserted by said amendment and insert in lieu thereof the following: "seven hundred thousand;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out all of the matter inserted by said amendment and insert in lieu thereof the following: "four million eight hundred thousand;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: After the word "dollars," at the end of the amended paragraph, insert the following: "Provided, That the Secretary of War is empowered to appoint as many hospital stewards as in his judgment the service may require, not to exceed an additional one hundred, but no more than one hospital steward shall be stationed at one post or station without special authority from the Secretary of War;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out by said amendment insert the following: "For additional pay for increased rank when in command by competent authority, \$50,000: Provided, That no part of this sum shall be used for pay of officers assigned to higher command than their rank in the Army, unless such service shall be continuous for a period of not less than three months;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the closing words of the paragraph, as follows: "transportation now made, and such other expenses as are necessary" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "current expenses;" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter inserted by said amendment; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the matter inserted by said amendment and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That the act approved January 12, 1899, granting extra pay to officers and enlisted men of the United States Volunteers, shall extend to all volunteer officers of the general staff who have not received waiting-orders pay prior to discharge, at the rate of one month to those who did not serve beyond the limits of the United States and two months to those who served beyond the limits of the United States; and officers and enlisted men of volunteer organizations who have served honestly and faithfully in the Volunteer Army of the United States during the war with Spain and have been honorably discharged without furlough, or by reason of their services being no longer required, or at any time by reason of wounds received, or disability contracted in the service and in the line of duty, and who have not received the extra pay granted in said act, or in subsequent acts of Congress supplemental thereto; and this act shall be deemed to apply to officers of volunteers who resigned and enlisted men of volunteers who were discharged upon their own applications subsequent to the issue of orders for the muster out of their organizations and prior to the dates of muster out."

And the Senate agree to the same.

JOS. R. HAWLEY,
THOS. H. CARTER,
F. M. COCKRELL,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

J. A. T. HULL,
THOS. M. JETT,

Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution authorizing the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives to close the present session by adjourning their respective Houses on Wednesday, June 6, at 3 o'clock p. m.; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bill and joint resolution:

A bill (H. R. 6876) providing for the transfer to Post 39, Grand Army of the Republic, at Lawrence, Mass., of certain guns now in possession of Battery C, Massachusetts Volunteer Militia; and A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 255) to print the annual reports of the American Historical Association.

CHINESE IN THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the Philippines, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State, with accompanying papers, relative to the status of Chinese persons in the Philippine Islands.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, May 22, 1900.

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

REPORT ON BEET-SUGAR INDUSTRY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith, for the information of Congress, a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture forwarding a report on the progress of the beet-sugar industry in the United States during the year 1899. It embraces the observations made by a special agent on the various phases of the beet-sugar industry of the Hawaiian Islands; also the results of analyses of sugar beets received by the Department of Agriculture from the different States and Territories, together with much other information relating to the sugar industry.

Your attention is invited to the recommendation of the Secretary of Agriculture that 20,000 copies of the report be printed for the use of the Department, in addition to such number as may be desired for the use of the Senate and House of Representatives.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, May 22, 1900.

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

AMERICAN NATIONAL INSTITUTE AT PARIS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State in regard to the proposed American National Institute at Paris, to be erected on ground to be donated by the Government of France and to be free from taxation.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, May 23, 1900.

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

FINAL ADJOURNMENT.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring): That the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives be authorized to close the present session by adjourning their respective Houses on Wednesday, the 6th day of June, at 5 o'clock p. m.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 4560) to provide for officers in the customs district of Hawaii.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10301) making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901; asks a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. LOUD, Mr. GARDNER, and Mr. SWANSON managers at the conference on the part of the House.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills:

A bill (S. 124) regulating permits for private conduits in the District of Columbia; and

A bill (S. 4048) to amend an act regulating the inspection of flour in the District of Columbia, approved December 21, 1898.

GOVERNMENT OF THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2355) in relation to the suppression of insurrection in, and to the government of, the Philippine Islands, ceded by Spain to the United States by the treaty concluded at Paris on the 10th day of December, 1898.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. MORGAN. Before the Senator from Wisconsin proceeds I desire to offer an amendment to the bill and have it read at the desk and printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Alabama will be read.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to insert as new sections the following:

SEC. —. In the execution of the powers delegated by Congress to the President by this act, he shall in good faith and without discrimination, secure to

every inhabitant of the Philippine Islands the equal enjoyment of all the personal rights and immunities that are due to citizens, under the Constitution of the United States.

SEC. —. The laws relating to currency and the purchase of silver coins and their recoinage, that are provided in the act for the government of Porto Rico, approved on the 12th day of April, 1900, shall apply to the Philippine Islands, and shall be faithfully enforced by the President of the United States.

SEC. —. Custom-houses for the collection of duties on imports shall be established by order of the President at such ports in the Philippine Islands as he may find necessary for the collection of customs duties, and he shall appoint collectors of customs and other officers necessary for that purpose. Said islands shall constitute a customs district of the United States, as to which the President shall have power and is required to exercise the authority that is given him by law with reference to any other customs district.

SEC. —. All exports and imports of every kind shall pass freely between said islands and the United States, into and from any collection district of the United States, and into and from any port of said islands or any port of the United States without other charge or duty than such as is lawful with reference to the coastwise trade of the United States.

SEC. —. All laws and regulations lawfully made, that apply to the coastwise trade of the United States, shall apply to and be enforced with reference to trade, and to imports and exports between the United States and the Philippine Islands: *Provided*, That vessels of any nationality shall be admitted to engage in the importation and exportation of cargoes between the United States and the Philippine Islands, on the same terms and conditions with vessels that are registered under the laws of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President, I regret exceedingly that it was impossible for me yesterday to conclude the remarks which I desire to submit upon this bill, and I express again my grateful sensibility to the Senate for the courtesy which permits me to conclude to-day. No one could be more anxious than I am, for personal reasons, to yield the floor to others.

I had referred to the protocol of August 12. It changed the entire status. What I mean by that is this: After the protocol was signed, agreeing to the suspension of hostilities, providing for a relinquishment of the title to Cuba and the cession of Porto Rico to the United States, it declared that the United States should hold and occupy Manila pending the negotiation of the treaty, which should define or settle "the control, disposition, and government of the Philippine Archipelago." We here bound ourselves by a contract with Spain, as solemn a covenant as one nation ever entered into with another. All compacts between nations rest upon honor, but this was of peculiar force, for the reason that a powerful nation was making covenant with one defeated. From the day that the protocol was entered into we were bound to hold Manila. If we had not, in the absence of knowledge of the protocol by our officers, captured it, by the terms of it Spain would have surrendered it to us and our troops would have taken possession of it.

It is not difficult, I think, to understand that Spain desired we should occupy Manila. It was to secure protection to Manila and to the people of Manila. Senators who criticize, as many have and as many will, the Administration and General Otis for objecting to a joint occupation of Manila by Aguinaldo and our own troops, predicated upon the demand that he withdraw his troops from the suburbs, as an injustice to an ally forget that we could not have permitted an insurgent against Spain, pending the negotiation of that treaty, to occupy Manila and its suburbs with us without a breach of national faith.

Nor is that all. It was said here the other day that the United States ought to have recognized, before the protocol was entered into, the independence of the Philippine republic, with Aguinaldo at its head. I will not go further into that at this time. I commented upon it yesterday. To me it is utterly fantastic in its folly from the standpoint of international law, and in this case from the standpoint of justice and national honor.

Those people had already shown that they had no conception of what was necessary to constitute a government. Agoncillo, back in April, had approached one of our consuls—I do not remember which—as a representative of a "Philippine republic" proclaimed the year before at Biak-na-Bato, proffering to the United States, as war with Spain seemed possible at least, a *treaty of alliance, offensive and defensive*, with neither government, laws, troops, flag, seaport, nor any visible power under the sun.

Mr. President, I call attention to this effect of the protocol; no matter what government had been established in the Philippine Archipelago, from the day the protocol was signed the Government of the United States could not without dishonor have recognized it. That protocol tied the hands of the United States and tied the hands of Spain. Until the ratification of the treaty we could consent to no change of status. Spain could create no change of status. From the moment that international obligation, informal in a way as it was, had been entered into Spain could not have sold the Philippines to any government in the world. We could not attack a Spanish garrison, for hostilities had been suspended. We could recognize no government, whatever it might be, created by insurgents against Spain or in any other way, for it remained an open question, so far as the legal effect of the protocol was concerned, whether at the end of the negotiations Spain might not still hold the Philippines.

It has been said that until hostilities broke out Aguinaldo was our ally. Senators have treated the performances of Aguinaldo after August 12, 1898, the date of the protocol, as acts done in aid of our cause, acts done as an ally of ours. That, Mr. President, is an impossibility. We could not, as I say, have fired a shot at a Spanish soldier or at the Spanish flag anywhere in the Philippine Archipelago, for by agreement hostilities were suspended. No more could Aguinaldo do this as an ally of ours or acting in our interest or by our procurement, for we could not honorably do through another what it would be a breach of honor to do ourselves.

Aguinaldo knew of the protocol, for he was informed in writing by General Otis and General Anderson that the protocol had created international relations and obligations between Spain and ourselves which we must observe, and which we could not observe if we entered into such an agreement as he proposed.

So it must be taken as settled, it can not be escaped, that from the date of the protocol, whatever Aguinaldo did against Spain in the archipelago he did on his own account, and not for the United States, and he did little. As I said yesterday, he simply marched in where Spain marched out in certain places, Iloilo having been abandoned by order of the Spanish Government, Aguinaldo's forces having been unable to take it, after the demand for the cession had been made by our commissioners and after Spain had yielded to it.

Another thing about it, Mr. President. If Aguinaldo had by his troops, after the protocol, captured Iloilo and other cities and extended his military power throughout the Philippines, it is very difficult, as a matter of international law, to see that that could have been efficacious for him or his so-called government as against us. The status could not be changed there by him except in hostility both to Spain and to us, and the principle contended for is not to be admitted.

It might be dangerous in the future to establish the principle that when two great powers, engaged in a war with each other, have suspended hostilities pending negotiation of a treaty of peace, a part of the citizens of one, inhabiting the territory, can take possession of the municipal governments which have been erected, can take possession of abandoned cities, starve out scattered and disheartened garrisons, and then, when the treaty is concluded, defeat the power of cession or a power of acceptance upon the theory that in the meantime nobody opposing them they had created an "independent government."

I take it that if there had been no insurrection in Cuba and our people had gone to war with Spain upon a *casus belli* of our own—if you please, the destruction of the *Maine*—and that war had proceeded to an end, we had captured Santiago, and captured Habana, the Spanish fleet had destroyed a city or two of ours and then been sent by our Navy to the bottom, and in treaty of peace Spain, had ceded Cuba to the United States, and in the meantime, pending negotiation of the treaty, the inhabitants of Cuba without resistance, under the leadership of some chieftain, had taken possession of interior posts, had starved out here and there a Spanish garrison, had issued proclamation of independence and established in that way a government—call it republic or call it what you choose—and then had insisted that Spain had lost the power of cession because of the existence of a government formed in this way, the United States would have paid no attention to it. The nations of the world never could allow this doctrine, for all that would be necessary to defeat at the end of a war a cession by way of conquest would be for the ceding or defeated nation to bring about such a change in the status pending negotiations as it is alleged came about here.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PLATT of Connecticut). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. SPOONER. I do.

Mr. HALE. I wish to remind the Senator that precisely the situation he has depicted has occurred time and again in history—that where as the result of a war a colony or an island or a dependency has been turned over to the conquering power, the conquering power, finding just the difficulties that he has cited, has abandoned it and been glad to wash its hands of it.

Mr. SPOONER. Does the Senator think in the case I have put we would have abandoned Cuba?

Mr. HALE. I think if it had been the best thing finally for us to do we would have done it.

Mr. SPOONER. But, because it would have been the best thing, finally, not because we were obliged to do it.

Mr. HALE. I think if we had found that the population in Cuba was as hostile to us as it had been to the power from which we had got the government, and if we had had the cession made to us, we would have abandoned it and would have been glad to get rid of it.

Mr. SPOONER. Well, that is a matter of opinion. I am of the impression that with Cuba lying so near us, with all the

trouble which had come to us from her proximity and the tyranny of Spain in Cuba, the United States in the case I have put would have taken Cuba and held it, giving to the people of Cuba what they never had had before, individual liberty and good government.

Mr. HALE. The Senator has more confidence than I have in the experiment we are trying to-day of teaching to the people of Cuba honesty and good government and good management and good affairs. I do not sympathize with him in the belief that this people has gained anything thus far in what it has taught the Cubans. I think we would have been better off if we had not taught the Cubans the lesson that has been taught in the last few months.

Mr. SPOONER. What lesson?

Mr. HALE. The lesson of fraud, speculation, appropriation of revenues, cheating, stealing—a carnival in every direction of corruption and fraud. I think it would have been very much better if we had not taught those people or tried to teach those people this.

Mr. SPOONER. It is a little tiresome for me to be called upon on this side of the Chamber to reply to a Democratic speech.

Mr. HALE. The Senator is not making any allusion of that kind to me?

Mr. SPOONER. I make this allusion because of the very general language of the Senator, not to impeach his loyalty to the party, which is unimpeachable.

Mr. HALE. I am as good a Republican as the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. SPOONER. I understand that.

Mr. HALE. I do not recognize any line of fealty to party obligations that compels me to consent to the proposition that everything has gone right in Cuba.

Mr. SPOONER. Nobody pretends it.

Mr. HALE. I think the experiment has been a failure. I would vote to-morrow, Republican or Democrat, to withdraw from Cuba and leave that people to establish and set up and maintain their own government. I would keep the proposition that was put into the declaration of war and leave the people there, and there is nothing that has happened since that goes to remove that impression from me. I do not understand that that is a question of party fealty.

I tell the Senator that he has no right, when I get up and protest against things that have occurred, to declare that I am making a Democratic speech. I am making a Republican speech, and the time will come, Mr. President, when Republicans will be glad if we get out of this thing without worse things happening than are happening now. In what I say I am more interested for the Republican party than I am for anything else.

Mr. SPOONER. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him for a question?

Mr. HALE. Certainly.

Mr. SPOONER. What does the Senator mean when he speaks in general terms about a carnival of fraud?

Mr. HALE. And corruption.

Mr. SPOONER. And corruption in Cuba.

Mr. HALE. I mean the things disclosed.

Mr. SPOONER. What things? I should like the Senator to file a bill of particulars.

Mr. HALE. I do not need to do that; it has been done already.

Mr. SPOONER. That is what the Senator means then by his statement that under our Administration in Cuba there has been a carnival of fraud and corruption, is it?

Mr. HALE. Now, Mr. President, it is not the Administration which is at fault. It is the natural result. There never has been an instance of the setting up of supreme government and uncontrolled government in a colony or an outside dependency that has not been attended with precisely the things that we have seen in Cuba.

In the early days of England in India the scenes of the days of Clive and of Warren Hastings were precisely, on a larger scale, what we have seen, and they disrupted the English Government; they turned out ministries and put in other ministries, because the English people would not allow the thing to be done. It is an incident. We are at fault; Congress is much at fault. The Administration is not at fault. The Administration has selected men who were believed to be good men—Major Rathbone, Mr. Neely, and other men—but the situation is such that we are simply seeing what has always been seen when this experiment has been tried.

We went into it with utter confidence, believing that it was an easy thing. I did not believe it was an easy thing. I voted against the treaty of peace because I believed it would lead to just these things. I believed that colonial dependencies and annexation would result in precisely what they have resulted in. I am glad to see that the Administration is trying to cure it, but I do not want anybody to say that it is an unexpected thing.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President, so far as anything I said is

concerned, the Senator's observations are, in the language of Shakespeare—

But a bolt of nothing, shot at nothing.

I was not engaged, and am not, in the discussion of any proposition to which the Senator's observations are pertinent. I was no more anxious to go into war with Spain than was the Senator. But when a Senator can see, looking at our relations with Cuba, no difference between the flag of the United States in Cuba and the flag of England under Clive in India, he is troubled, to my mind, in some degree with mental obliquity. What is the difference? We went to war to free Cuba. Have we done Cuba and the Cubans no kindness, Mr. President, by pouring out millions of our money and shedding the blood of our soldiers in order to drive Spanish tyranny forever from Cuba? Has the Senator any suspicion in his mind that the pledge made in the resolution passed by Congress as to the temporary character of our occupation in Cuba is not to be kept?

Mr. HALE. I have.

Mr. SPOONER. Kept not simply to the letter, but kept in spirit?

Mr. HALE. I have very grave suspicion, Mr. President. I am glad the Senator has asked that question.

Mr. SPOONER. Then, Mr. President, the Senator is a pessimist, beyond any I have ever met.

Mr. HALE. Now, let me say to the Senator I think there are very powerful influences in this country; I think they are largely located in New York City; I think they are largely speculative and connected with money-making enterprises that are determined that we shall never give up Cuba. I think there is a dangerous cloud in the sky; I think the time will never come, unless something earnest and drastic is done by Congress, when the last soldier of the United States will be withdrawn from Cuban soil. I do not think the President favors that.

Mr. SPOONER. Favors what?

Mr. HALE. Holding on to Cuba. I do not think the Secretary of War favors that. I discover (and the Senator has different apprehensions from mine if he does not discover) very powerful influences—commercial, mercantile, money influences, and political influences—that are opposed to our ever withdrawing from Cuba. I take up the newspapers, as the Senator may, that are foremost in the large cities, in favor of the general programme which is now going on, and not only do I not find a single intimation or hint that we are to withdraw from Cuba, but I find every day intimations and hints that we are never to withdraw from Cuba.

The Senator must not exclude from his enlightened mind the things that are in the public mind. No matter whether he denies it or not, I am profoundly impressed and profoundly depressed by the fact that I find in hundreds of quarters a determination that we shall never withdraw from Cuba, but shall retain her as a possession of the United States.

Mr. SPOONER. Now, Mr. President, it is hardly fair for the Senator to interject his speech in my remarks upon the Philippines.

Mr. HALE. I was simply answering the proposition of the Senator.

Mr. SPOONER. If I were, as the Senator says he is, inclined to doubt for one moment that the United States Government will seasonably withdraw from Cuba, I should be ashamed of the Government.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President—

Mr. SPOONER. Now, I wish to go on.

Mr. HALE. That assurance from the Senator more than repays me for all that I have said. I shall count upon him in the future.

Mr. SPOONER. To say that the Senator will count upon me in the future is little less than an insult.

Mr. HALE. Oh, no.

Mr. SPOONER. For it implies, Mr. President, that but for my assertion the Senator had doubt if I might not be willing to see violated the pledge given by the Government.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President—

Mr. SPOONER. He does not so mean it.

Mr. HALE. The Senator knows—

Mr. SPOONER. I know he does not so mean it.

Mr. HALE. He knows I do not mean it, but I was very glad to hear that assurance from the Senator.

Mr. SPOONER. He need not have been.

Mr. HALE. I say it is not every man that feels that way.

Mr. SPOONER. I hope there is no man in the United States who does not feel that way.

Mr. HALE. I am glad to hear the Senator say that.

Mr. SPOONER. This is a Government of honor, Mr. President, and it is a people of honor. The people of the United States did not go to war to free Cuba, pouring out the blood of its sons, knowing not what bitter fruitage the war might bring to them,

without a conscience, without a love of liberty; and when the Senator expresses a fear that the conscience of the people of the United States, their desire to keep the pledge of this Government, will be lulled to slumber by the power of commercialism he degrades the people and underestimates, in my judgment, their integrity.

Mr. HALE. Still, I am afraid of it.

Mr. SPOONER. What have we done for Cuba? When, since the morning stars first sang together in the heavens, has any people done for another people what we have done for Cuba? And, Mr. President, as rapidly as may be, in absolute good faith, not being hurried by demagoguery, not being speeded in violation of national honor by insinuation and mere politics in a Presidential election, this Administration will, I am certain, go forward to redeem to its utmost the pledge to Cuba.

We have given the best government to the people of Cuba thus far it ever had. We have given to the people of Cuba a government the like of which they never could have had without our intervention. We have changed their criminal laws so that now a man can not be thrown into a dungeon and detained indefinitely without right of counsel. We have ameliorated in every way by military order conditions there in the administration of justice which were dreadful. We have maintained order in Cuba. Every man's life is safe in Cuba. Woman's honor is safe in Cuba. Tyranny and starvation have gone forever out of Cuba. Who is responsible for it? This "commercial" people who possibly may care nothing for its honor and its pledges!

Of course, Mr. President, there has been speculation in Cuba. Everyone regrets it; no one more than I. Everyone is ashamed of it. But in no government ever instituted has that not occurred. It has happened in Georgia. It has happened in New Orleans.

Mr. TILLMAN. It happened all over the South when the carpetbaggers had it.

Mr. SPOONER. Yes; and it has happened since the carpetbag governments. It happens in banks. I doubt not it has happened in Maine. Governments must be conducted by human agencies. There is no company which can guarantee the honesty of purpose of employees of the Government. If the Senator had listened to the very able and eloquent and entirely frank speech of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. PLATT), I think he would have been satisfied that instead of there having been or being a carnival of corruption in Cuba there was a discovery of certain frauds in the postal service by the Administration, followed up by the Administration, made public by the Administration, and that the Administration is doing everything in its power to put the men who were guilty of it behind the bars. The government in Cuba is a military one. It rarely happens that an officer of the Regular Army in administration anywhere is not prudent, careful, and honest; and that administration ought not to be charged by general phrase, as the Senator seems to charge it, with permitting a general, almost universal, carnival of fraud in Cuba.

No, Mr. President, no one thinks, so far as I know, of violating our pledge to Cuba. We were to pacify the island; and, a little more than that, which Spain demanded that we should put in the treaty, as we were to occupy Cuba, that so long as we occupied it or remained there as a military occupant we would discharge the duties imposed by international law upon a military occupant, which, largely stated, is the protection of life and property and liberty. Spain insisted upon that not out of regard solely to the insurgents, but to safeguard the interest and protection of the loyal Spaniards who had lived there, and, as the treaty puts it, of the natives who have remained loyal to Spain.

Mr. HALE rose.

Mr. SPOONER. Now, Mr. President, I beg the Senator not to interrupt me—

Mr. HALE. All right.

Mr. SPOONER. For I am proceeding under embarrassment; not any embarrassment from what the Senator has said to me, but physical disability.

Keeping in mind our obligation to the people of Cuba—those who were insurgents and those who were Spaniards—we will see to it that just as soon as it can safely be done a government is formed there and turned over to that people. I say "we" will see to it. I speak for no one here but myself. I say with confidence that we will see to it, because of my implicit faith in the honor of the people of the United States. It never will turn out, my friend from Maine, that any man in any country can point to the Teller resolution and say with truth that it was a legislative lie.

Mr. HALE. I hope so.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator need not hope so. He had better know so.

Mr. HALE. I do not know.

Mr. SPOONER. Well, he ought to know.

Mr. President, I have been beguiled by the Senator from Maine,

as I am always beguiled by him, away from the matter which I was discussing.

I return to the line of my argument when interrupted and repeat, under all the circumstances and conditions in the Philippines, the attempted establishment of a government without substantial opposition by Aguinaldo after the protocol would give in international law no foundation for its recognition, and would create no obligation of recognition by us in any event.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. TILLMAN. Unless it is entirely agreeable to the Senator I will not interrupt him because he is unwell, but the subject he is now discussing—

Mr. SPOONER. If the Senator will state what it is that he desires to know, I shall be glad to hear it.

Mr. TILLMAN. It is in connection with the very subject upon which you have had the discussion with the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE]. I will call the Senator's attention to the resolution to which he has been addressing himself.

Mr. SPOONER. What resolution?

Mr. TILLMAN. Your bill, then.

Mr. SPOONER. I will get to that bill presently.

Mr. TILLMAN. You were discussing that bill.

Mr. SPOONER. I will get to that.

Mr. TILLMAN. But you will not get to that phase of it.

Mr. SPOONER. I will get to every phase of it, if the Senator will allow me.

Mr. TILLMAN. I hope the Senator will not shut me off just now.

Mr. SPOONER. No.

Mr. TILLMAN. I wish to call the attention of the Senate and the Senator to the phraseology of the bill introduced by him. It reads:

That when all insurrection against the sovereignty and authority of the United States in the Philippine Islands, acquired from Spain by the treaty concluded at Paris on the tenth day of December, eighteen hundred and ninety-eight, shall have been completely suppressed by the military and naval forces of the United States, all military, civil, and judicial powers necessary to govern the said islands shall, until otherwise provided by Congress, be vested in such person and persons, and shall be exercised in such manner as the President of the United States shall direct for maintaining and protecting the inhabitants of said islands in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property, and religion.

Now, with the Senator's permission, I will direct his attention to the effect of that bill if it becomes a law. We are under obligations in Cuba to establish a government there and turn it over to its own people.

Mr. SPOONER. I am through with Cuba.

Mr. TILLMAN. I think the Senator ought to have enough confidence in my integrity of purpose here to allow me to state my point.

Mr. SPOONER. I can not resist the Senator.

Mr. TILLMAN. I was calling attention to the difference between Cuba and the Philippines. We are now in Cuba under military law, and the President is omnipotent inside the Constitution, as some Senators contend, and some contend that the Constitution does not bind him. In the Philippines the Senator proposes that the President shall continue to do what he now does, except that after the military have suppressed all rebellion, all resistance, then the President can establish a civil government there, and appoint judicial, executive, and other officers to govern ten million of people over there—an army of carpetbaggers beside which this little squad now in Cuba looting the postal revenues would be but a mere awkward squad.

Mr. SPOONER. If the Senator ever finds a carpetbagger in heaven he would prefer to go to the other place. [Laughter.]

Mr. TILLMAN. I undoubtedly would, Mr. President [laughter]; and if the Senator from Wisconsin and the people of Wisconsin had suffered from the carpetbaggers as we in South Carolina have, he would feel so, too. It is against carpetbagging in all its forms that we, who are opposed to the acquisition of the Philippines and the governing of subject peoples from this country by the appointing of proconsuls, protest here.

Mr. SPOONER. From all I can learn, I would infinitely prefer the carpetbagging even of South Carolina, if I had any property, to the government of Aguinaldo up to date; and when the Senator assumes and other Senators assume that there is any purpose in the Government to fill up Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippines, with appointees without regard to fitness, with men unfit for the discharge of the duties, I think he would do better to wait until there is some foundation for that suspicion. I have seen nothing of it as to the Philippines; and no man ever lived, Mr. President, with higher purpose to safeguard by the most rigid inquiry and in the strictest possible way the interests of these people while in our charge by the appointment of honest and capable men than President McKinley.

Mr. TILLMAN. Let us grant that; I will grant it; but it is a

question as to whether you can by such a system of government ever get anything but dishonesty.

Mr. SPOONER. There may be now and then a thief, but he will be punished, and under this Administration he will be ferreted out by Government officers and sent to prison. Over in the Philippines General Otis has arrested three men and thrown them into prison for embezzlement. They were tried by commission, and two of them found guilty and punished. They were not Americans as I remember it.

The world is not growing worse, Mr. President. Almost every man charged with official duty wants to do the right thing, just as Senators want to do their duty; and the argument which is based upon a universal indictment of the integrity of men who are willing to go to these distant places has no substantial foundation in fact. If Mr. Bryan should be elected President, he would have the same difficulties. I hope he never will be elected, but if he should be he would have the same difficulties. I am willing to believe that he would try to select honest men, and when he found one as to whom he had been mistaken he would secure for that man prompt conviction and punishment.

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. SPOONER. That is a part of the subject to which I do not care now to pay further attention. It is not at all pertinent.

Mr. TILLMAN. If you do not like to be interrupted on account of physical disability—

Mr. SPOONER. It is not physical disability just at this minute. I never felt better in my life than I do at this moment. My objection is to being interrupted by a suggestion which is entirely impertinent to the matters which I wish to discuss. When I say "impertinent," I do not refer to the Senator, of course—I mean irrelevant; I use it in the legal sense.

Mr. TILLMAN. If the Senator will permit me, I will state that, so far as I can judge of the temper of the Democratic party, if Mr. Bryan should be elected, the difficulty of governing those people by carpetbaggers will not trouble anybody very much. We do not consider that it is a function of the United States to undertake to educate 10,000,000 of Asiatics, who have been taught in the Spanish schools, what free government is or what self-government is; and we do not propose to undertake to find enough honest men to go over there and administer the affairs of those islands in a decent Democratic way.

Mr. SPOONER. If you did, you would have to go into the Republican party, probably, for some of them. [Laughter.]

Mr. TILLMAN. We certainly would not ask you to lend us Mr. Rathbone, or Mr. Neely, or Mr. Thompson, or any of that ilk.

Mr. SPOONER. Well, Thompson is in jail and Mr. Neely under bail.

Mr. ALLEN. If the Senator will permit me, I trust he will not bring Mr. Bryan into this discussion at all. Mr. Bryan is a private citizen, and I think it would more comport with the dignity of the Senate to leave his name out of the discussion.

Mr. SPOONER. Well, Mr. President, I am willing to take lessons in dignity from the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. TELLER. Will the Senator allow me a word?

Mr. SPOONER. Certainly.

Mr. TELLER. I think the Senator from Wisconsin is attempting to discuss this question from a legal standpoint, but he has been drawn off by questions, which are, as he says, impertinent in a legal sense, and he probably has been induced to say some things that he would never otherwise have thought of saying. If I were on the floor I believe I would know how to deal with the question, but feeling ill, as the Senator from Wisconsin does, he is rather too good natured, and I appeal to the Senate to let the Senator proceed uninterruptedly. That will be better for him and better for us.

Mr. TILLMAN. Better for those in favor of his proposition.

Mr. TELLER. Whether in favor of it or not, it would be better for the dignity and high character of this Senate.

Mr. SPOONER. I hope I have not seriously offended my friend from Nebraska.

Mr. ALLEN. Not at all.

Mr. SPOONER. I recognize the fact that Mr. Bryan, while a distinguished leader, is in private life, although he is not a private citizen.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Bryan's name ought not to be voluntarily brought into the Senate and involved in a discussion here, and I think it would comport more with the dignity of discussion in this Chamber not to do so.

Mr. SPOONER. I do not hold myself altogether responsible for bringing it in, but I feel entirely at liberty to do so, and I shall do so in a respectful way if the course of my argument requires it.

Now, Mr. President, I do not know what real fealty to the doctrine of the Declaration of Independence—and I refer to it only for a moment—Senators or any political party would show which would turn over to an oligarchy, composed of not more than one-sixth of the inhabitants of the Philippine Archipelago,

the government and the fate of ten million people, a vast majority of whom we think we have reason to know do not desire it, and a sudden withdrawal, as is suggested by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN], of our troops from the Philippines upon the theory, which I am glad to hear him avow, that we have no duty in the Philippines—

Mr. TILLMAN. I did not say that.

Mr. SPOONER. Practically that, Mr. President; for I do not hesitate here to say that any man or any party which in the environment, in which this country now is in the Philippines, should propose that it should withdraw its forces and leave Manila and the Filipinos who have been friendly to us—the autonomists, as Aguinaldo in a proclamation of his own of June 12 last denominates them—and the people who have nothing in common with him, to a government created by him and officered by his satraps, would violate every plain duty which could grow out of a difficult and delicate situation.

The resolution of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON], manly and straightforward as that Senator is in legislation here, is based upon a different proposition from that; and if we should withdraw our troops from Manila, as suggested by the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PETTIGREW], and enter into negotiations for peace with a government which is destroyed, if it ever had any substantial existence, and that withdrawal should be followed by a massacre in Manila, if the "clubs" organized by Sandico and those who were to join in the massacre or extermination should visit their vengeance on the Europeans in that city, nothing, Mr. President, in the history of this Government or this country could ever in the slightest degree redeem us from the stain of that cowardly withdrawal and stigma thus put upon our honor.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. SPOONER. What is it?

Mr. TILLMAN. I wish the Senator would allow me to state more fully what I would consider—

Mr. SPOONER. That is just exactly what I do not want the Senator to do.

Mr. TILLMAN. But the Senator puts me in a false attitude as to what I wish to do in the Philippines, and then he goes on and argues as though he had some basis for it other than his own imagination, and I must insist that that is not fair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Several SENATORS. No, no.

Mr. SPOONER. Why, of course, Mr. President, I find it impossible to decline to yield to Senators.

Mr. TILLMAN. The Senator said a moment ago he never felt better in his life, and I am glad he is more than able to take care of himself in any debate on this floor.

Mr. SPOONER. I feel well, but I am afraid that my colleagues do not, or will not, if I continue much longer.

Mr. TILLMAN. It seems that some of your colleagues want to take care of you, when I am very sure you can take care of yourself better than they can take care of themselves.

Mr. SPOONER. I do not agree with the Senator in that.

Mr. TILLMAN. I wish to say this in regard to what I consider the duty of this Government, and I am not any more than one Democrat: We have destroyed the only government that was there—Aguinaldo's. It may be that it was a dictatorship, and I dare say it was, but still it was the only government they had there. It had the support of the people, whether voluntarily or involuntarily does not matter. Now, we have destroyed that government; we have got that government broken all to pieces, and we are fighting there for the suppression of the guerrillas, small bands, who are harassing our troops.

I think if those guerrillas would stop we would get a condition by which we could reestablish some government there, if we would simply say to those people, "We do not propose to continue to govern you by military force or by carpetbaggers sent from the United States, but we will allow you to set up some sort of a government of your own as soon as you are in a condition to do so, which will insure law and order and protection for life and property to citizens and foreigners there. We will leave you to deal with your own people in your own way, because we do not believe it is our duty to use force to protect you from yourselves."

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator having protected himself in the RECORD, I shall spend no time now, but I will, a little later on, on that branch of the subject, when I come to explain what I think the duty of this Government is, and what I think the people of the United States will deem it to be.

The men who propose to turn over, without first ascertaining their wish about it, the fate of ten million people to the government of Aguinaldo and the Tagalogs, have a different understanding from that which appeals to me of that part of the Declaration of Independence which refers to the consent of the governed.

Self-government is not a right. Self-government is a faculty.

It does not come to a people in a day; it does not develop in a night; and if there is anywhere in this world where a proposition has been announced and carried into effect that the majority entitled by law to govern; but in the opinion of a minority unfit, shall not be permitted to govern, it is not in the Philippines, but it is in the United States.

But, Mr. President, for the purpose of establishing the proposition that this Government has acted toward Aguinaldo with Punic faith—that is the adjective, "with Punic faith"—I am compelled briefly to consider the evidence upon which, in the several relations, that charge is made.

First, it is said that Aguinaldo was promised independence, and that for the Government of the United States not to accord it is for it to perpetrate an act of national dishonor.

I deny, Mr. President, that there is any basis whatever for the assumption that Aguinaldo was promised independence or that the Filipinos were promised independence.

It is claimed by Aguinaldo that he was promised independence by our consul at Singapore, Mr. Pratt, and at Hongkong, Mr. Wildman. Mr. Day, inferring from a publication in a Singapore paper that possibly Mr. Pratt had been indiscreet, cabled him June 16, 1898, to avoid unauthorized negotiations with Philippine insurgents, to which Mr. Pratt replied June 19 as follows:

SECRETARY OF STATE, Washington:

No intention negotiate; left that Dewey, who desired Aguinaldo come.

PRATT.

June 16, 1898, Mr. Day wrote to Mr. Pratt, among other things, as follows:

If in the course of your conferences with General Aguinaldo you acted upon the assumption that this Government would cooperate with him for the furtherance of any plan of his own, or that in accepting his cooperation it would consider itself pledged to recognize any political claims which he may put forward, your action was unauthorized, and can not be approved.

June 20, in reply to cable of June 16, Mr. Pratt wrote the Secretary of State as follows:

My action in the matter was limited to obtaining the assurance of General Aguinaldo's willingness to cooperate with our forces, communicating this to Commodore Dewey, and, upon the latter's expressing a desire that he should come on as soon as possible, arranging for the General to do so.

Under date July 28 Mr. Pratt wrote the Secretary of State as follows:

I declined even to discuss with General Aguinaldo the question of the future policy of the United States with regard to the Philippines; that I held out no hopes to him of any kind; committed the Government in no way whatever, and in the course of our conferences never acted upon the assumption that the Government would cooperate with him—General Aguinaldo—for the furtherance of any plan of his own, nor that in accepting his said cooperation it would consider itself pledged to recognize any political claims which he might put forward.

The Senator from Washington some time since, in the course of a speech here, read from a Singapore paper what he contended indicated an admission in a public speech by Consul Pratt that he had promised independence. That Senator omitted to state, although I know he would have stated it if he had known it, what I state now, that when Mr. John Foreman made substantially the same statements in the first edition of his book on the Philippines Consul Pratt filed a bill in equity and obtained an injunction restraining him from the further distribution of the edition, upon the ground that the statement was not true, and in the second edition and all subsequent editions there is a note at the beginning of the book correcting the statements and announcing the omission of the pages from the book.

Mr. Wildman also was heard from upon the subject. Under date of August 8, 1898, from Hongkong, he addressed the following cablegram to Mr. Moore, Assistant Secretary of State:

Never made pledges or discussed policy of America with Aguinaldo further than to try and hold him to promises before Dewey took him to Cavite, believing it my duty, it being understood that my influence is good. If report contrary, I disavow.

Could anything be more idle than to predicate a charge of dishonor upon an alleged breach by the United States of a political promise made by a consul? Consuls are not diplomats. As the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] said the other day, they are only commercial agents.

It has been said here that there are men learned in international law surrounding Aguinaldo. That is, I think, quite true; and how foolish it is to suppose that Aguinaldo and the junta would for one moment, had such promise or assurance been given, relied upon them.

It is alleged that Admiral Dewey promised Aguinaldo independence. Aguinaldo says that himself. He did not claim it, so far as I have been able to discover, until a short time before the outbreak of hostilities, and in the "True version of the Philippine revolution," which he published to the world.

On May 26 the Secretary of the Navy cabled Admiral Dewey as follows:

It is desirable, as far as possible, and consistent with your success and safety, not to have political alliances with the insurgents, or any faction in the islands, that would incur liability to maintain their cause in the future.

June 6 Admiral Dewey replied to this dispatch:

Receipt of telegram of May 26 is acknowledged, and I thank the Department for the expression of confidence. Have acted according to the spirit of Department's instructions therein from the beginning, and I have entered into no alliance with the insurgents or with any faction.

Admiral Dewey has since specifically denied it. He denied it in the letter over his own signature addressed to Senator LODGE; he denied it in his cablegram to the Secretary of the Navy; he denied it in a memorandum inserted in the report of the Philippine Commission, which he signed; he denied it in a statement sent to the Senate by the President only a day or two ago.

No one would impute to Admiral Dewey, who conducted affairs in the Far East after the fall or destruction of the Spanish fleet with consummate ability, such ignorance as to his power and duty as for one moment to believe that he had pledged to this man, whom he had never seen before and of whom he knew nothing, independence for a government which he was yet to establish.

In a memorandum written for the preliminary report of the Philippine Commission, of which Admiral Dewey was a member, he says, referring to his first meeting with Aguinaldo, May 19:

No alliance of any kind was entered into with Aguinaldo, nor was any promise of independence made to him, then or at any other time.

Aguinaldo, however, in what is called "the true version of the Philippine revolution," says on one page here—I will spend but a moment upon it—that on one occasion Admiral Dewey, accompanied by General Anderson, visited him, and that in the presence of General Anderson this statement was made by Admiral Dewey:

The Admiral continued: Documents are useless when there is no sense of honor on one side, as was the case in respect of the compact with the Spaniards, who failed to act up to what had been written and signed.

Have faith in my word, and I assure you that the United States will recognize the independence of the country. But I recommend you to keep a good deal of what we have said and agreed secret at present. I further request you to have patience if any of our soldiers insult any Filipinos, for, being volunteers, they are as yet undisciplined.

Admiral Dewey, on January 30 last, denounced this pamphlet and the statements, in so far as they related to him, as a tissue of falsehood, thus:

DEAR SENATOR LODGE: The statement of Emilio Aguinaldo, recently published in the Springfield Republican, so far as it relates to me, is a tissue of falsehood. I never promised him, directly or indirectly, independence for the Filipinos. I never treated him as an ally, except so far as to make use of him and his soldiers to assist me in my operations against the Spaniards. He never uttered the word "independence" in any conversation with me or my officers. The statement that I received him with military honors or saluted the Philippine flag is absolutely false.

Sincerely, yours,

GEORGE DEWEY.

It will be noticed that at the interview in which Admiral Dewey is alleged to have uttered the foregoing, General Anderson was present. General Anderson was asked by telegraph by the Adjutant-General, under date May 11, concerning this conversation, to which he replied as follows:

PHILADELPHIA, PA., May 14, 1900.

ADJUTANT-GENERAL,
Washington, D. C.:

Telegram received. I have Aguinaldo's pamphlet. His statement as to Admiral Dewey's promise of recognition and documents not being necessary, are not true as to any occasion when I was present. I can recall only two occasions on which we saw Aguinaldo together. All his statements inaccurate, except that we were fighting a common enemy.

ANDERSON, Brigadier-General, Retired.

It has seemed strange to me that any American should be found to make the charge of dishonor upon the Government or its Administration based upon nothing except the statements of Aguinaldo, contradicted, as he is, over and over again.

But that is not all. Some documents have been captured over there. Among others is a document which gives the secret proceedings—it has been sent to the Senate—of the junta in Hongkong on May 5. Aguinaldo was there, Agoncillo was there, Teodoro Sandico was there, Lopez was there, Montenegro was there. It is signed by a large number of them in testimony that what transpired is faithfully set down and sealed.

Mr. STEWART. May, 1898?

Mr. SPOONER. May 5, 1898. It says:

The president described the negotiations which took place during his absence in Singapore with the American consul of that English colony; both agreed that the president should confer with the Admiral commanding the American squadron in Mir Bay, and if he should accept his propositions as beneficial, in his judgment, to the Filipinos, he should go in one of the cruisers which form the fleet and take part in the subsequent events.

This was after the conversation with the consul. Strange, is it not, if the consul had promised independence to a government to be formed by Aguinaldo, that the thing which above all other things he desired, it is thought, in this communication to his associates he should have neglected to state? There is not one word in these proceedings which indicates that any such promise had been made; that any such subject had been discussed—not one word. But there are statements in this paper which show that no such promise could have been made, or that if it was made it was not relied upon.

Aguinaldo did not wish to go. He wished to send four members of the junta. He gave certain reasons why he did not wish to go, and one of the reasons was that Admiral Dewey might call upon him if he went to enter into some agreement before cooperating—I do not use the language—which would control or embarrass the future of his country; and you will find again and again expressed here the thought that the time might come—It is apparent, in fact, from this secret paper, it was anticipated—when the guns of the Filipinos would be turned against the Americans, because it is stated here—

After arguments had been made by various members of the junta in favor of Aguinaldo's going, the record is thus:

Notwithstanding the previous remarks, the president (Aguinaldo) insists that he considers it dangerous for him to go to the Philippines without a previous written agreement with the Admiral, since it may happen that if he places himself at his orders he may make him sign or seal a document containing proposals highly prejudicial to the interests of the fatherland, from which may arise the following grave disadvantages:

First. * * * These are the means, he thinks, which should be first employed to find out certainly what are the intentions of the United States in regard to that country. * * * He adds, besides, that the Admiral, there being no previous contract, may not divide the arduous necessary to guarantee the happiness of the fatherland."

After various speeches, by Sandico and others, the document proceeds:

The authority to treat, which the President thinks of giving to the other chiefs, without reflecting at all upon their personal deserts, they do not believe can be as effective as his personal attention to the matter, to such serious affairs as those which are the subject of discussion. There will be no better occasion than the present for the expeditionary forces to land on those islands and to arm themselves at the expense of the Americans and assure the attainment of our legitimate aspirations against those very people.

The Filipino people, unprovided with arms, will be the victim of the demands and exactions of the United States, but provided with arms will be able to oppose themselves to them and struggle for their independence, in which consists the true happiness of the Philippines.

After referring to the "prestige which he (Aguinaldo) acquired in the last rebellion," it proceeds:

Once the President in the Philippines, with his prestige he will be able to arouse those masses to combat the demands of the United States if they colonize that country, and will drive them, the Filipinos, if circumstances render it necessary, to a Titanic struggle for their independence, even if later they should succumb to the weight of the yoke of a new oppressor.

Were they relying upon a promise of independence?

They were arranging then, before Aguinaldo and his companions went back to Manila, for a contingency in which, having obtained arms upon a promise of cooperation they should use those arms against soldiers of the United States. No man with judgment could find what is written in this secret proceedings consistent at all, either with a promise of independence or their reliance upon a promise of independence.

It is not worth spending time on at all if it were not that on this is based a charge of dishonor, and without warrant. I for one can not discuss this matter and permit that charge to go unanswered when the facts make a complete defense against it.

He made no claim of any such promise until very late, and after he had gone to Manila he wrote to General Anderson, under date July 24, "I came from Hongkong to prevent my countrymen from making common cause with the Spanish against the North Americans;" and he justified the proclamation of his dictatorship upon that ground, and in all the letters or proclamations in which he besought independence he never claimed until his proclamation, issued shortly before the outbreak of hostilities, that it had been promised him, and in his letter to the President, which has been so greatly lauded for its literary merit, he asked for independence, but he did not contend at all that it had been promised to him. So why charge bad faith upon the Administration for not according to Aguinaldo's government or alleged government, the moment he formed it, independence as having been promised?

It is said that there was implied recognition of his government, and that upon that ground we have been acting in breach of faith. Is that true? Is it sustained? The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PETTIGREW] says it is sustained. He based his charge for one thing upon the allegation that Admiral Dewey saluted the flag of the Philippine republic.

Mr. PETTIGREW. He undoubtedly did.

Mr. SPOONER. Well, then, Admiral Dewey is published by the Senator before the world as a concrete liar.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Not by me.

Mr. SPOONER. He denies it. The American people will believe Admiral Dewey when he says he never saluted the flag. The Senator claimed, I think—and I trust he will not regard me as personal; he nodded to me, and that is why I referred to him—that we had recognized them by conveying one of the Philippine ships—was it into Subig Bay? I think it was. Am I right?

Mr. PETTIGREW. Yes; Subig Bay.

Mr. SPOONER. Does the Senator still claim that we conveyed a Philippine ship to Subig Bay?

Mr. PETTIGREW. I will answer the Senator.

Mr. SPOONER. Very well.

Mr. PETTIGREW. The insurgents attacked the Spanish forces in Subig Bay. They sent a vessel to Manila to ask Admiral Dewey to assist. Dewey received word from this vessel, and he sent the *Raleigh* and another ship to Subig Bay, captured the Spanish garrison, and turned the prisoners over to Aguinaldo's forces.

It appears from a statement of the officers of the Government that the vessel of Aguinaldo did not accompany our vessels, our vessels leaving in the night, so that the vessel which had come to ask them to return to their assistance was not aware of their departure. I said in a resolution of inquiry that it had been stated that they did convoy or go in company with a Philippine vessel to Subig Bay to secure the surrender of the Spanish troops, and I asked for the information. My resolution was tabled by the Senate.

Mr. SPOONER. Yes; I voted to table it.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Afterwards the Administration admitted everything that had been said except that our vessels did not go back with the Filipino vessel which came to ask them for their assistance. Here was an alliance and the turning over of the prisoners to the allies.

Mr. SPOONER. I voted against the Senator's resolution. I remember the Senator's resolution. It was craftily drawn. I do not mean intentionally so, of course; but it was so drawn as that for the Senate to have adopted it would have been a finding of fact by this body that there was a Philippine Republic in the international sense and a Philippine flag; and because I believed that to be untrue, and not as the Senator seemed to think at the time of all of us, that we were afraid of laying the truth before the American people, I voted to lay the resolution upon the table. Has not the Senator been of the opinion that one or more of our naval ships convoyed a ship of Aguinaldo's to Subig Bay? Was not that the Senator's opinion?

Mr. PETTIGREW. That was my opinion at the time I presented the resolution.

Mr. SPOONER. Is it the Senator's opinion now?

Mr. PETTIGREW. I am in doubt about it now. I never could get all the information. We never have had it. The Administration does not give us the full information. We never have had any consecutive story of this revolt and the circumstances connected with it. We are left to draw our conclusions and gather our information from a censored press, from suppressed information. It is not considered compatible with the interest of the President as a candidate for reelection to furnish us the information, and we do not get it, and we have not got it.

Mr. SPOONER. Oh, I should think once in one session would be sufficient for the Senator to insult the President. The President has manifested no purpose whatever to withhold from the Senate any information, and he has been sending information here in response to the request of the Senate month after month during this session. But if the Senator has doubt about the proposition or the allegation of fact that one or more of our naval ships convoyed an alleged Filipino ship, with an alleged Philippine republic flag flying at its masthead, to Subig Bay, he has doubt of the veracity of Captain Coghlan.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] in his speech read the other day in the presence of the Senate the following letter:

MY DEAR SENATOR LODGE:

FEBRUARY 1, 1900.

I was in command of the expedition sent by the Admiral (*Raleigh* and *Concord*) to the mouth of Subig Bay, July 6, 1898, to capture Grande Island, then held by the Spaniards. I wish to affirm as strongly as human words can do so that Aguinaldo's people did not accompany us, and that they took no part whatever in that capture. No one but the Admiral, Lieutenant Brumby, Captain Walker, and myself even knew where we were to go. We left at midnight, without lights of any kind, not even signaling, as usual, for permission to get under way, and no one knew except the flagship and a vessel or two near us, that the vessels (*Raleigh* and *Concord*) had moved from their berths. It was not known until next morning that we had gone out of sight of our fleet. At this very time the so-called gunboat of Aguinaldo was anchored at Cavite, and did not learn of our departure until next day about noon. We captured Grande Island about 10.30 a. m., July 7, and no Filipino boat of any description appeared about Subig Bay until that evening about 7 p. m., when the boat we had left at Cavite came in and expressed the greatest surprise at our capture, telling us they had hoped to take part in the attack. So far as Aguinaldo's people having anything to do with the capture, after it had been done I instructed their chief at Alongapo, about 5 miles up the bay, that his people must in no way bother with the island, and to prevent them I moved the *Raleigh* out into the bay, where the searchlights were used all night to see that no insurgents went near the island. In my opinion, those on the island could have held out indefinitely, as they were well provided with everything, and the Aguinaldotes had no artillery—one small gun only on their so-called gunboat, and the rest of her armament (*i*) consisting of pieces of 3-inch pipe stuck through chocks and holes in her sides to stimulate guns.

There may not be much glory arising from that capture, but on behalf of my naval comrades, who did it alone, I object to having any of it taken away by anyone attempting to falsely assign us help.

Yours, very truly,

J. B. COGHLAN,
Captain, U. S. N.

This charge of dishonor, based upon the allegation that we recognized a republic over there by convoying a ship flying its flag, falls to the ground; and I know the Senator will not challenge the word of Captain Coghlan.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I will say that I think the paper the Senator has in his hand was sent in in response to a resolution passed by the Senate, which I introduced on the 27th of April.

Mr. SPOONER. Yes.

Mr. PETTIGREW. And that resolution reads as follows in regard to the Subig Bay incident:

The President is also requested to inform the Senate whether the flag of the Philippine republic was ever saluted by Admiral Dewey or any of the vessels of his fleet at any time since May 1, 1898. Did Admiral Dewey, at the request of Aguinaldo or any officer under him, send the vessels *Concord* and *Raleigh* to Subig Bay to assist Aguinaldo's forces in the capture of the Spanish garrison at that place? Did said vessels assist in the capture of the Spanish garrison, and after the surrender did they turn the prisoners thus taken over to the Philippine forces?

I think that paper corroborates and answers in the affirmative every one of those questions, except the question of saluting the flag. As far as that question is concerned, I will show by the executive officer of Admiral Dewey's own ship that he did salute the flag; I will show by the statement of Halstead, who was a Government official, that he did salute the flag; and I will show by letters from numerous soldiers that we saluted the Philippine flag and the Philippine troops every time they came in the presence of our Army. I will then leave the question as to who is right and who is wrong to be fought out between these different people. I shall try to do this in reply to the Senator's speech.

Mr. SPOONER. All right. Then the Senator admits that in response to this particular resolution of his, there was no attempt upon the part of the Administration to suppress information.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Mr. President—

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator will admit also that the information which was sent, so far as Captain Coghlan's letter covers it, disposed of all of his allegations of fact put in an interrogative form, except the matter of the saluting of the flag.

Mr. PETTIGREW. The Senator says I will admit numerous things. I admit nothing of the sort.

Mr. SPOONER. I was wrong in supposing the Senator would admit it.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Except that the reply confirms the statement I made in every particular except in that of saluting the flag. That is what I said, and as I understood the Senator—

Mr. SPOONER. Did not the Senator charge that Aguinaldo's vessel helped in the capture of the place?

Mr. PETTIGREW. I think not.

Mr. SPOONER. I thought you said so a moment ago.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Not at all. I did not say so, and I do not remember ever to have said so.

Mr. SPOONER. Did you not say we helped them to take it, or assisted them in taking it?

Mr. PETTIGREW. I have just read what I said in the resolution, and I think everything in the resolution is answered in the affirmative by the information received except the saluting of the flag, and then I made my statement in regard to that. I wrote to the officer to ascertain whether we did salute the flag or not, and I have an autograph letter to the effect that we did.

Mr. SPOONER. I withdraw my statement that the Senator admitted anything. I did him an injustice, and I will supplement that by saying that I do not expect the Senator to admit anything except that this Government has been dishonorable and guilty of punic faith in its treatment of Aguinaldo.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Yes; I think I can prove that.

Mr. SPOONER. I think the Senator can not prove it. In fact I know the Senator can not prove it.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I do not think there is any doubt about it.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator can no more prove it than he can prove or did prove the other day that a majority of the South Dakota regiment were unwilling to serve after their term expired. I am glad the Senator could not prove that. There never comes into a soldier's life any prouder thing than that after his time has expired he served in battle under his flag; and when President McKinley congratulated the State of South Dakota, which I marched over as a soldier before the Senator ever saw it, and congratulated her people and congratulated that regiment that regardless of the expiration of their time they had gone into battle under our flag and fought with great gallantry, he recognized, as the truth warrants, a crown upon the brow of South Dakota which no man can ever take from her.

Mr. PETTIGREW. If the Senator will permit me, I read the statement of the surgeon of the regiment and the lieutenant-colonel that 90 or 95 per cent of the boys wished to be discharged. Some of the soldiers told me, immediately after the President made that statement, that it was untrue. The reason why the South Dakota boys were not proud of the service in which they had been conscripted against their will was because they were not in sympathy with the effort to destroy the liberties of another people.

Mr. SPOONER. I suspect the fact that some of them felt that way is partly attributable to the industry of the Senator, not to the soldiers themselves. [Laughter.]

Mr. PETTIGREW. That is a matter of opinion, which opinion the Senator has a right to entertain.

Mr. SPOONER. I say that because the discussion indicated that in a great many letters from the Philippine Archipelago some were replies to letters written by the Senator.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Not one of them.

Mr. SPOONER. Yes; there were some of them I am quite certain. And I say another thing, that the prompt transmission of the governor's insulting letter to the President to be read to the soldiers there was politics—Populistic politics, not American politics—and may have had something to do with inciting the agitation among some of the soldiers. I will never believe in dishonor in this Government or in the Administration, Democratic or Republican, unless I am obliged to. I will not hunt for stain upon the honor of my own country.

Mr. President, it is said repeatedly that Aguinaldo was an ally of the United States, and that in firing upon him when he attacked us—I use that phrase advisedly; we were guilty of Punic faith toward an ally. A flimsier thing never was asserted as foundation for a charge in a Presidential or any other campaign against an Administration than that. An ally in the international sense he was not and could not be. There was no Filipino nation. There was no Filipino people in the organized sense. No man could for one moment contend that there was an organization which could enter into a treaty of alliance. None such was ever pretended. As I said the other day, the Filipinos were in law enemies of the United States, not friends, because they were subjects of Spain. The Senator from South Dakota smiles.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Yes.

Mr. SPOONER. Does he dispute it?

Mr. PETTIGREW. Certainly. It is the most absurd proposition the Senator has made.

Mr. SPOONER. There never has been a work on international law which does not support that proposition; it has been decided by the Supreme Court of the United States; it is absolutely fundamental; it is in the most modern as well as in the most ancient books, that, as a matter of law, and important consequences flow from it, the subjects of a government at war with another become the enemies of that other. The Senator is a good lawyer, he is a man of ability, and if he will address his mind to that proposition to-night he will not deny it to-morrow.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I certainly shall.

Mr. SPOONER. Well, I will help him.

Mr. PETTIGREW. To deny it?

Mr. SPOONER. No; to find the law; I know where to find it.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I am well aware of the Senator's ability, and I know he is a great student, for I studied law as a boy in his father's office when he was just beginning to practice, and in complimenting me perhaps he had a notion of, in a measure, complimenting himself.

Mr. SPOONER. No; I did not mean to do that. What I meant was this, and the Senator will do me that justice, to say that I have examined the question, and I thought it might facilitate the Senator's investigation, if he cared to make it, for me to give him a list of the authorities in which I found it.

Mr. PETTIGREW. As an abstract principle, never good in practice or heard of in any history on the face of the earth, perhaps the Senator is correct.

Mr. SPOONER. Oh!

Mr. PETTIGREW. But to say that the Filipinos were our enemies under the circumstances is such a terrible stretching of the abstract principle which the Senator seeks to invoke that it has no application.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senator would not have said that if he had listened longer. I said the Filipino people were in law the enemies of the United States while we were at war with Spain. Aguinaldo and such of his confreres who individually cooperated with us against Spain were not, of course, our enemies. All others were; and if the Senator understood me as saying that the subjects of Spain who entered our Army—if any should—or who aided us in a war with Spain, were our enemies under this proposition of law, he misunderstood me. But Aguinaldo himself is not to be called, all things considered, an ally of ours. If he was an ally of ours, he was a very treacherous ally of ours, and it was not many weeks after he reached Manila before Admiral Dewey discovered that he ceased to be much of an ally and was inclined to "set up" business on his own account; so much so that he was disgusted with him, and, as one of the papers puts it, thought he had the "big-head."

Mr. Wildman, writing Mr. Moore, Assistant Secretary of State, under date of August 9th, says:

Aguinaldo had for some weeks been getting what Admiral Dewey called the big head, and writing me sulky, childish letters.

He claimed he was after independence, and, as indicated by the secret proceedings of the junta, he was proceeding in his performance after he reached Manila largely on his own account, of

course, in a way aiding us—I concede that—in fighting Spain, but for reasons of his own and for a purpose of his own. Why, Mr. President, it is stated by Mr. Whitmarsh, the special commissioner over there of the Outlook, that Aguinaldo had planned to attack our first detachment of troops when they landed at Paranaque.

In the preliminary report of the Commissioners it is stated:

The landing of the American troops at Paranaque on July 15 so exasperated the revolutionary leader that he wished to attack at once, but was deterred by lack of arms and ammunition. He finally decided to wait until the fall of Manila, enter the city with the American troops, secure the arms of the Spanish soldiers if possible, and then make his attack.

Mr. TELLER. The first one?

Mr. SPOONER. Yes; I believe the first one, that he had intended to attack them and prevent their landing. He permitted them, however, to land, but from the day General Anderson landed there his attitude was not the attitude of an ally; his correspondence was not the correspondence of an ally; his conduct was not the conduct of an ally. I assert, Mr. President, without fear of successful contradiction, upon all the facts which are within our reach, that his conduct from the day General Anderson arrived there was the conduct of an enemy.

Mr. BERRY. What date was that, if the Senator will permit me?

Mr. SPOONER. I can not give the precise date. It was in June or early in July.

Mr. PETTIGREW. The Fourth of July.

Mr. SPOONER. That we landed there. If you look at the correspondence, you will see constant complaints; you will see a constant jealousy; you will see that he insisted upon maintaining his position; you will find that his troops were insolent to our men. You will find that Aguinaldo plumed himself as being friendly rather than just in not cutting off from Manila, after our troops had arrived there, the water supply. He constantly wanted recognition. He sought in every cunning way which could be devised to secure some recognition from General Anderson of him as president or of his alleged government. He prohibited the people from furnishing supplies to General Anderson.

Was that the conduct of an ally? Anderson wanted horses; he wanted supplies; he had newly arrived in the country. He proffered, of course, to pay for them. The correspondence shows that he received no reply; that he received no supplies, and that Anderson was informed upon sufficient authority that they were forbidden by Aguinaldo, and Professor Worcester says that witnesses swore before the Commission that Aguinaldo had ordered them not to furnish our Army with any supplies; and they were not furnished until General Anderson informed him that if he did not permit the supplies to be furnished, things that our troops needed, he would pass him and take them.

It is stated (I presume the Senator does not believe that) that as early as June he was in negotiation with the Spaniards against us. I believe it, and I have good reason to believe it.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Mr. President, there is no doubt but that the Spaniards made offers and propositions to Aguinaldo, and there is no doubt but that he considered them. But he brought them to us and stated to us (and the conversation, I think, must be familiar to the Senator) that he had rejected them and refused to accept their offers and propositions. He seems to have been using this for the purpose of trying to compel, if possible, that public recognition of his government to which he felt he was entitled. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President, on the contrary, I believe it to be a fact, and I believe the assertion is warranted by the evidence, that Aguinaldo was in treaty with the Spanish authorities to surrender Manila to him and join their forces in fighting us. One thing is very certain: That as early as October 25, long before the outbreak of February 4, 1899, before the cession of the Philippine Archipelago to us by Spain, Aguinaldo entered into negotiations with the Spaniards and proved himself, if an ally to us, to be a traitor to us.

Mr. PETTIGREW. When was that? What is the date?

Mr. SPOONER. The 25th of October, 1898. The Senator evidently has not, in his search for information, found it, but the President sent it to the Senate some time ago—April 18. Here it is. It is worth reading, because men will be told all through this country during the coming campaign (and that is what most of this business is for; nobody is deceived about that) that Aguinaldo was our ally; that up to the time we attacked him and his forces at Manila he was loyal to us as an ally.

Mr. PETTIGREW. No; we were not loyal to him.

Mr. SPOONER. We were loyal to him. We gave him more loyalty, Mr. President, than he was entitled to. We stayed there month after month enduring his insolence and the insolence of his soldiers while they endeavored to taunt, I believe by his command, our soldiers into an act of hostility, and I will prove it before I finish.

But, Mr. President, about October 25 the Spanish general at

Iloilo was apparently willing to surrender to us. When General Otis sent the expedition to Iloilo he supposed that the Spanish would surrender to us. He had received information that they desired to do it. Am I wrong about that? But they found when they reached there that he had by order of the Spanish Government evacuated the place. Now, here is what Aguinaldo wrote to him. Up to this time we had occupied no position of hostility to Aguinaldo, and no man living can truthfully say we had. This is a captured document.

[Private.]

REVOLUTIONARY GOVERNMENT OF THE FILIPINES,
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
Malolos, October 25, 1898.

The Excellent Señor General DIEGO RIOS.

RESPECTED GENERAL: I write to you without any desire of offending either your dignity or your patriotism, or of interfering in your high duties in the present circumstances, so critical for all of us, Filipinos, Spaniards, and Americans. I write to you, General, actuated solely by the desire of doing an act of evident justice, compatible with your honor and with those high duties which I cite above, and especially with the hope—

“Especially with the hope”—

OF YET SAVING FROM THE SHIPWRECK THE SOVEREIGNTY OF SPAIN IN THESE ISLANDS.

While we were fighting to liberate the Filipinos from the tyranny of Spain he was hopeful “of yet saving from the shipwreck the sovereignty of Spain in these islands.”

Mr. LODGE. Give the signature.

Mr. SPOONER. I will give the signature in a moment.

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator give us the date of that?

Mr. SPOONER. It is dated Malolos, October 25, 1898.

Mr. CULLOM. Before the cession?

Mr. SPOONER. Yes, before the cession.

Mr. TILLMAN. It was while the cession was being discussed, however, and after the demand had been made.

Mr. SPOONER. It was while our commissioners were negotiating the treaty.

Mr. PETTIGREW. And if I recollect aright, after—

Mr. SPOONER. As I recollect it, before even our commissioners had demanded cession. The cession was demanded October 31 and yielded November 28.

Mr. PETTIGREW. But after Dewey had captured all his vessels and confiscated them.

Mr. SPOONER. Had captured all his vessels and confiscated them! What an awful violence!

Mr. TILLMAN. How did the President get that letter?

Mr. SPOONER. It was captured; I do not suppose Aguinaldo's consent was asked. He proceeds:

I shall explain myself, General, to see if you can understand me, and to see whether it will be the same as with General Augustin, who did not care to pay any attention to the frank warnings I gave him, with noble intentions, in my letter of June 9 last.

Had he not been negotiating with General Augustin, in command of Manila in June? That is why I said I was satisfied that as early as June this “enemy” of Spain and this “ally” of ours was in treaty with Spaniards in Manila against us to save “from the shipwreck the sovereignty of Spain in these islands.”

Mr. TILLMAN. Did the Senator ever hear the fable of the wolf and the lamb?

Mr. SPOONER. I have heard pretty nearly all the fables. I could call one or two to mind for the benefit of the Senator if I wanted to, but I will not take the time. I will read this again:

I shall explain myself, General, to see if you can understand me, and to see whether it will be the same as with General Augustin, who did not care to pay any attention to the frank warnings I gave him, with noble intentions, in my letter of June 9 last. Time has unfortunately justified me, and I am able to declare that of all the Spanish generals you alone have known how to defend the Spanish flag in these islands.

“To defend the Spanish flag in these islands;” that flag of tyranny; that flag of cruelty; that flag of merciless and long-continued outrage in the islands.

Ah! if the others had only known how to sustain it as you have, how different would be to-day the sad condition of the Spanish Empire in these lands. * * *

Ally! Enemy of Spain!

I am informed that you are considering surrendering the place to us or to the Americans. After six months of vigorous siege and of total abandonment, I understand how you can prefer us to the others.

The way to make this surrender is to join us and proclaim the federation of the Filipino republic with the Spanish republic, recognizing the chieftainship of our honorable president, Señor Emilio Aguinaldo. A fraternal embrace will take place between Filipino Visayans and Spaniards; there will be hurrahs for Spain

Ally!

and the Filipinos united as a federal republic—

Independence of Spain I thought was the sole object of his life—your troops will pass into the common army—

What common army? You will see in a moment—

you will be promoted to be a lieutenant-general; the Spanish employees in the Visayas will be supported by us; the government will pass to our provincial councils and local juntas.

Those who want to go back to Spain will be sent back at our expense, with enough to pay their way to Spain, and the flags of Spain and the Filipinos will

float side by side. You will give an account of this to Madrid and especially to Pi. Marfal; AND IN THE MEANTIME WE SHALL FIGHT THE AMERICANS TOGETHER.

Ally!

We shall conquer, and then we shall wait and adjust our future relations.

I will not take the time to read it all. He adds:

Your transfer to our side does not really involve treason to Spain, since the moment sovereignty passes to the Americans you are free to transfer your allegiance. This is in accordance with the principles of national honor. On the other hand, if you join us you cause the following: First, liberty for all the 9,000 Spanish prisoners in our hands—

He did not have them; he never had them—

and then it would serve as the first base of the new alliance between Spain and the Filipinos—

Three hundred years of oppression forgotten, love of liberty and independence inspiring every thought, he negotiated for an “alliance between Spain and the Filipinos”—

and then it would serve as the first base of the new alliance between Spain and the Filipinos, and then from both will come honor and applause for you as having been the one fortunate enough to effect it. This is all that I can say to you at present, and I hope that you will tell me that you agree with me, and then I shall be able to present this to MY GOVERNMENT and obtain from it an agreement to what I have written AS A PRIVATE INDIVIDUAL.

Your most respectful and affectionate,

1-1-9-6-1-M.

It is signed “1-1-9-6-1-M,” written on the paper used in the private office of the president, and “M,” the letter at the end of it, is the first letter in the word “Miong,” and “Miong” in the Philippine cipher is “Emilio.” Is there any warrant for my assertion that in June, as well as in October, before the demand, even by our commissioners, of a cession of the Philippines, he was in treaty with Spain for the purpose of fighting the Americans?

Ally, indeed!

I can not go into further detail, Mr. President. You remember his anger, because his troops were not permitted to go into Manila with his army, and loot the city. Somebody denies that. It was denied here the other day; but in the papers that complaint, or demand, is made by his commissioners, and General Otis's reply, stating that there is no “spoils of war” according to our code of war, addressed to Aguinaldo himself as in reply to a demand of his. No repudiation of it ever came from Aguinaldo.

For months before he attacked us his position had been one of hostility. His soldiers had occupied a position of hostility.

It is said we recognized his cooperation and he cooperated with us in going in and taking Manila. I will not spend much time upon that except to say that one of his bitter complaints was from the beginning that he was ignored by the American commander; that our plans were not given to him; and when our troops attacked Manila he complained that he did not even have notice of it, apparently which was true.

Mr. PETTIGREW. As the Senator seems to be addressing me—

Mr. SPOONER. That was not my purpose.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I think that I am justified in interrupting him, with his permission.

Mr. SPOONER. I always address the most intelligent man on the jury.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Here again, Mr. President, the Senator is undertaking to compliment me because he thinks my education, having been under his father and under his tutelage, will reflect great honor upon himself. I will release him from any further allusion to that subject.

Mr. SPOONER. It was under my father's; not under mine. My father taught the Senator law. I am trying to teach him patriotism. [Laughter.]

Mr. PETTIGREW. Well, I am very glad to receive such instruction as the Senator can give; but it seems to me his stock is meager, or he would be more jealous of the honor of our flag than to defend the attack, under that banner, upon the liberties of another people.

Mr. SPOONER. I love the flag. Mr. President, I would be ashamed of the flag if it were the flag of a Government that had ever attacked the liberties of a people; and when I say to the Senator that, in my eye, there is no stain upon the flag—there was one once, but blood washed it away; there has been none since; there never will be one again—he will assume from my reply that I deny his statement that under our flag an attack has been made by this Government upon the liberties of a people. Will the Senator tell me where the flag of the United States has ever gone but as the flag of liberty, except, perhaps, to Mexico in the interest of slavery?

Mr. PETTIGREW. I will answer the Senator. I presume the information is correct, as all the information we get from Manila is censored. The newspapers publish a dispatch saying that our flag went to one of those islands, and, without losing a man, we murdered 300 of its inhabitants, and all within a month.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President, censoring is necessary sometimes, and I suppose it was necessary over in Manila, as it always is in the midst of military operations. I think if there had

been a censorship here there would have been less insurrection and bloodshed there. I do not mean to say anything against free speech, but I do mean to say, and I will prove it, that the cable has carried from here over there in rich abundance an encouragement to a prolongation of insurrection and warfare in the Philippines. I have no criticism of any word uttered in debate upon the treaty, whatever its effect might be. That was a present duty, that was a question pending before us for debate, and every Senator was right to give expression to every thought which occurred to him for it or against it. It is not always true morally, even in a free country, and I can remember the time when a great many good men in this country wept bitter tears of heart-breaking sorrow over words which, in the exercise of free speech, were spoken, which brought death, they thought, into many a home.

There is no reason, so far as I know, to believe that General Otis has kept any information from the President of the United States, from the Secretary of War, or from the Adjutant-General. He may have censored some things to the newspapers; every government in the world does that in time of war, and must do it.

I was saying that Aguinaldo bitterly complained—and there is nothing in the talk about our recognizing him and dealing with him as an ally and recognizing his forces as the forces of the government—that he was not notified even of our purpose, the time, or the plan of our attack upon Manila. It is stated, and I think it is true, that a portion of his men fired upon our troops—possibly by misadventure; that fifty of our men took 150 arms from his men, which were afterwards returned; and all the time in correspondence, Aguinaldo, so far from claiming recognition by our generals, is complaining that he did not receive it; and over and over again he was informed by General Anderson, by General Merritt, by General Otis in writing that the military officers of the United States had no power to recognize his government or him as President.

Mr. President, I should be glad to finish this evening, but I have lost so much time by interruptions that I hardly know whether I have trespassed in an unfair way upon the Senate.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CULLOM. If the Senator will allow me, I will move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Illinois, that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After eight minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, May 24, 1900, at 12 o'clock m.

NOMINATION.

Executive nomination received by the Senate May 23, 1900.

POSTMASTER.

John H. Mitchell, to be postmaster at Pueblo, in the county of Pueblo and State of Colorado, in the place of George Seaver, deceased.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 23, 1900.

PROMOTION IN THE ARMY.

Infantry arm.

Capt. William W. McCammon, Fourth Infantry, to be major, May 12, 1900.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE VOLUNTEER ARMY.

To be assistant quartermasters with the rank of captain.

Kensley J. Hampton, of Kentucky, May 9, 1900.

First Lieut. Peter W. Davison, Twenty-second Infantry, United States Army, May 12, 1900.

To be assistant commissary of subsistence with the rank of captain.

First Lieut. Henry G. Cole, Twenty-third Infantry, United States Army, May 15, 1900.

Forty-second Infantry.

First Sergt. Thomas Carl, Company A, Forty-second Infantry, United States Volunteers, to be second lieutenant, May 9, 1900.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, May 23, 1900.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. GROW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to make a personal explanation.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to make a personal explanation.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Before unanimous consent is given, I should like to know what is the nature of this.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the gentleman stated to the Chair that he purposed rising to a question of personal privilege.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I have no objection to that.

Mr. GROW. It is a statement which has been made with reference to myself, and will take but a minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman will proceed.

Mr. GROW. Alex. I. Yowell, in what he calls "My booklet for 1898," professing to get his information from Colonel Elliott, in charge of the Washington Aqueduct, has the following:

In June, 1862, at the request of the Secretary of the Interior, Hon. Caleb H. Smith, to whose Department the aqueduct had just been transferred, I accompanied the Secretary and a number of members of Congress on a tour of inspection of the aqueduct by way of the canal. Opposite Cabin John Bridge several of the party disembarked and walked to the bridge for a nearer view. Returning in hot haste, "Do you know," said the Hon. GALUSHA GROW to the Secretary, "that d—d rebel Meigs has put Jeff. Davis's name on the bridge?" Turning to me, the Secretary said: "The first order I give you is to cut Jeff. Davis's name off the bridge."

Mr. Speaker, yesterday for the first time I was informed of this statement, and that it has appeared in some newspapers as a historic fact. I never was at this bridge, alone or with anybody else, and never made any such declaration to any human being. [Applause.]

WAR-REVENUE TAXES.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I am authorized by the Committee on Ways and Means to present the following resolution and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Ways and Means have leave to sit during the recess to consider the subject of the revision and reduction of the war-revenue taxes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I want to ask why we can not do that now? It is surely time that the war taxes should be scaled down; and why can not the Ways and Means Committee do that now?

Mr. PAYNE. If we get consent for this resolution, I will state to the gentleman fully.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I would rather you do it before you get consent.

Mr. PAYNE. Very well; if I can have consent of the House for ten minutes, I will state the reasons.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks that he may have ten minutes for the purpose of explaining the resolution. Is there objection?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Pending that, I would like to ask the gentleman from New York if, before any discussion on the passage of this resolution, he will not allow some time on both sides?

Mr. PAYNE. Very well. Say that there be ten minutes on each side, after the resolution is before the House. A reasonable time; I understand there are some matters pressing of some importance.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. What do you consider a reasonable time.

Mr. PAYNE. A few minutes. I do not know that we need much time in this matter.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I suggest to the gentleman having the resolution in charge that we have an hour's debate, thirty minutes on a side.

Mr. PAYNE. I understand there are matters of very pressing importance here this morning, and I do not want to take up so much time.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. We have got time to burn.

Mr. PAYNE. I think we can get along without taking up so much time.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I think it would save time if the gentleman would agree to that.

Mr. PAYNE. If I can have unanimous consent now and twenty minutes on a side, I am willing to consent to it.

Mr. SULZER. I hope it will be one-half hour on each side.

Mr. PAYNE. I think the minority of the committee would be content with twenty minutes on a side.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The members of the Ways and Means Committee will consent to a half hour on each side.

Mr. PAYNE. Very well. Mr. Speaker, I will make that request.

Mr. DE ARMOND. I think, Mr. Speaker, there ought to be more time than that.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

Mr. STEELE. Who made the objection, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. DE ARMOND. I will inform the gentleman from Indiana